Par. 8.2.1.1.52
836

Volume I
No. 1 — 21

Thursday
22nd May, 1952

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

OFFICIAL REPORT

(Part I - Questions and Answers)

CONTENTS

Members Sworn [Cols. 2—18].

PARLIAMENT SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

Price Six Annas (Inland)
Price Two Shillings (Foreign)

Date: 18.11.2014

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part I—Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Thursday, 22nd May, 1952

The House met at a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

COMPENSATION TO DISPLACED PERSONS

*93. **Giani G. S. Musafir:** Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state when compensation is expected to be paid in respect of verified claims, to what extent and in how many instalments?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): No decision has as yet been taken on these matters.

گیانی جی - ایس - مسافر : میں آنریبل منسٹر کو زیادہ پریشان نہیں کرنا چاھتا - صرف یہ سوال پوچھتا ھوں کہ آیا کلیمس ملیں گے یا نہیں -

[**Giani G. S. Musafir:** I do not want to weary the hon. Minister. I only want to know whether claims would be paid or not.]

श्री ए० पी० जैन : नहीं, परेशान तो आप काफ़ी कर सकते हैं, उस से तो मुझे कोई इनकार नहीं है। लेकिन क्लेम्स मिलने के बारे में और न मिलने के बारे में गवर्नमेंट नोटीफ़िकेशन निकल गया है। मेरे ख्याल में उस से ज्यादा तो मैं कुछ नहीं कह सकता।

39 PSD

[**Shri A. P. Jain:** Oh no, you can weary me as much as you like, I don't mind that. As far as payment in respect of claims is concerned a Government notification in this regard has been issued. I do not think I can say anything more on this subject.]

Shri Kasliwal: May I know when the decision is expected to be taken?

Shri A. P. Jain: We are making every effort to expedite it.

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : निर्वासित व्यक्तियों के सम्बन्ध में जांच किस तरह हुई है? जांच के समय निर्वासित व्यक्ति और भारत सरकार का प्रतिनिधि वहां पर रहता था या नहीं ?

[**Babu Ramnarayan Singh:** How was the inquiry in connection with the claims of displaced persons held? Were the displaced persons and a representative of the Government of India present at the time of the inquiry?]

श्री ए० पी० जैन : जांच तो यहां पर हिन्दुस्तान में हो रही है। हर एक आदमी जो इस बात का दावा करता है कि उस ने वहां पर कोई अचल सम्पत्ति छोड़ी है तो वह अपनी क्लेमशीट दाखिल करता है। फिर उस को मौक़ा दिया जाता है कि वह किसी काग़ज़ी शहादत से या ज़बानी शहादत से तसदीक़ करे और तब उस की क़ीमत का अन्दाज़ा लगाया जाता है और उस अन्दाजे के बाद क़ीमत क़ायम की जाती है।

[**Shri A. P. Jain:** The inquiry is being held here in India. Anybody who claims having left any immovable property there, files a claim-sheet. Then the claimants are given an opportunity to support their claims with documentary or oral evidence, whereafter evaluation of the property is made and its price fixed.]

Shri Hukam Singh: Is the Government prepared to consider the advisability of postponing the recovery of rents for the property occupied by displaced persons and getting it adjusted towards their claim for compensation that might be subsequently granted to them?

Shri A. P. Jain: I think that will be very inequitous to the poorer type of refugees and in particular the unattached women, old and infirm persons for whom I believe every Member of this House has a large volume of sympathy.

CLAIMS OF DISPLACED PERSONS

*94. **Giani G. S. Musafir:** Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount of claims of displaced persons registered by Government; and

(b) the amount of claims so far verified?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) and (b). Information cannot be supplied at this stage.

گیانی جی - ایس - مسافر : کیا مانئیے منتری یہ بتا سکتے ھیں کہ جو مسلم نواسی یہاں سے جائداد چھوڑ گئے ھیں اس کی مالیت کتنی ھے اور جو جائداد ویسٹ پاکستان میں ھندو اور سکھہ چھوڑ کر آئے ھیں اس کی مالیت کتنی ھے -

[**Giani G. S. Musafir:** Will the hon. Minister kindly state the total value of properties left behind by Muslim evacuees and the total value of properties left behind by Hindus and Sikhs in West Pakistan.]

श्री ए० पी० जैन : मैं समझता हूं कि यह अवाम के मफ़ाद में नहीं है कि इस मौक़े पर यह इत्तिला दी जाये ।

[**Shri A. P. Jain:** I do not think it is in public interest to supply the desired information at this juncture.]

Shri N. L. Sharma: How long will it take for the Government to give information to this House with regard to the claims?

Shri A. P. Jain: When the whole information has been collected and some policy has been formulated.

श्री ऐम० ऐल० द्विवेदी : क्या मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह जान सकता हूं कि जो पाकिस्तान से लोग इधर आये उन के डाकखानों के जो सेविंग्ज़ सर्टिफ़िकेट्स हैं उन के कैश करने में क्या दिक़्क़त है ?

[**Shri M. L. Dwivedi:** May I ask the hon. Minister as to what is the difficulty in getting Post Office Savings Certificates held by displaced persons from Pakistan cashed?]

श्री ए० पी० जैन : साहब, इस का तो इस सवाल से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है ।

[**Shri A. P. Jain:** Sir, this is not relevant to the question.]

पंडित ए० आर० शास्त्री : मैं जानना चाहता था कि जो नीति इस मामले में निर्धारित की गई है वह क्या है । क्या माननीय मंत्री बताने की कृपा करेंगे ?

[**Pandit A. R. Shastri:** I want to know what policy has been framed in this connection. Will the hon. Minister be kind enough to throw light on it.]

श्री ए० पी० जैन : अभी कोई नीति निर्धारित नहीं है ।

[**Shri A. P. Jain:** No policy has yet been framed.]

BORDER RAIDS

*95. **Shri Hukam Singh:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of border raids throughout Indo-Pakistan border between the two Punjabs during the years 1949, 1950 and 1951;

(b) the number of cattle heads lifted; and

(c) the estimate of loss in human life during these raids?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Shri Satish Chandra):

	1949	*1950*	*1951*
(a)	65	34	22
(b)	815	125	137
(c)	25	4	1

Shri Hukam Singh: Was any compensation received from Pakistan for any of these losses?

Shri Satish Chandra: The compensation is given by the offending party to the satisfaction of the other party.

Shri Hukam Singh: May I know whether and, if so, what amount was given to these sufferers by both the Governments?

Shri Satish Chandra: All the sufferers received compensation according to the damages suffered by each party. The question relates to hundreds of raids and it is not possible to give the breakup in each case.

Shri Kasliwal: Is he in a position to give any information about border raids between Rajasthan and Sind in these years?

Shri Satish Chandra: Sir, the question relates to border raids between the two Punjabs.

Mr. Speaker: He wants to know whether it would be possible for him to give it now. If he has got the information............

Shri Satish Chandra: No, Sir. I have not got the information. The question relates to the two Punjabs.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether the progressive decrease in the number of border raids during the past three years was due to the strengthening of our border patrols or because of the good sense which prevailed on the Pakistan Government?

Shri Satish Chandra: Partly so.

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : जब जब बाहर से या पाकिस्तान से इस मुल्क पर हमला होता है तो हर बार लिखा जाता है या नहीं और लिखा जाता है तो वहां से उत्तर आता है या नहीं ?

[**Babu Ramnarayan Singh:** Whenever this country is raided from the side of Pakistan or some other country, is that country written to, if so, is any reply received?]

श्री सतीश चन्द्र : जी हां, हर बार लिखा जाता है और उस के बाद जी बार्डर के डिस्ट्रिक्ट के पुलिस आफ़िसर्स हैं वह दूसरी तरफ़ के डिस्ट्रिक्ट के आफ़िसर्स से मिलते हैं और उस मामले का जो फ़ैसला होता है उस पर अमल किया जाता है ।

[**Shri Satish Chandra:** Yes, Sir, we write every time. The police officers of border districts meet their counterparts on the other side and the decisions taken by them are given effect to.]

Shri N. S. Nair: Will the hon. Member be pleased to say whether the Indian citizens on the Indo-Pakistan border have been allowed to use arms freely against these raiders?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Those who have arms will certainly use arms if there is an attack on them; not otherwise, I hope. But many of these raids are really petty thefts of cattle-lifters who cross and try to take away cattle this way or that way. If such a raid occurs anywhere it is not noticed—I mean except as a police matter. If it occurs on a border it becomes an international matter naturally. But if I may add. on a border there are a number of people. our citizens. who normally possess licensed arms and if they are attacked they can certainly defend themselves with those arms.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: With reference to the answer to part (b) of the question may I know whether the number of cattle heads lifted includes the number lifted from Pakistan?

Shri Satish Chandra: It is the number of cattle heads lifted by Pakistan nationals from inside our borders.

گیانی جی - ایس - مسافر : کیا سرکار اس بات پر غور کر سکتی ھے کہ بارڈر پر رھنے والے جو اس طرف کے لوگ ھیں، ان کو زیادہ ھتھیاربند کیا جائے اور زیادہ ھتھیار دئے جائیں تاکہ وہ اپنی اچھی طرح حفاظت کر سکیں -

[**Giani G. S. Musafir:** Can the Government consider supplying more arms to the people living in the border areas so that they may protect themselves effectively?]

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid these are all suggestions.

QUARTERS FOR DISPLACED GOVERNMENT SERVANTS

*96. **Shri Hukam Singh:** Will the Minister of **Works, Production and Supply** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of displaced Government servants to whom residences were provided by the Estate Office during 1951-52; and

(b) the number of applications received during this period for provision of accommodation?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): (a) 654.

(b) 2,162.

Shri Hukam Singh: May I know the number of displaced government servants that still require to be rehabilitated and provided with residences?

Sardar Swaran Singh: There is no question of rehabilitating them. Government is doing everything possible to give accommodation to displaced government servants.

Shri Hukam Singh: What is the number that require residences now—that is, the number pending before Government?

Sardar Swaran Singh: That number is 1,958.

Shri Hukam Singh: Do Government undertake to provide residences to everyone of them?

Sardar Swaran Singh: Government is doing its best to provide accommodation for all of them. They were first accorded a preferential treatment, but from 29th February last that preferential treatment is no longer applicable and they have to take their chance along with other government servants.

Shri Hukam Singh: What is the number that might be given accommodation during this year, that is 1952-53?

Sardar Swaran Singh: That is covered by the reply that has been given. There are no separate figures available from 1st January till the last date which is asked in the question. But I may add that the overall position of these displaced government servants who are still unprovided as compared to government servants in general is quite favourable and there is no real hardship so far as these displaced government servants are concerned.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know how long Government proposes to take in order to provide residences for these 2,000 people?

Sardar Swaran Singh: I have replied that the number of government servants in general who are still unprovided with government accommodation is pretty large and the proportion of unprovided displaced government servants does not compare unfavourably with the other government servants in general who are still unprovided with government accommodation.

Shri Hukam Singh: Do Government consider other government servants at par with displaced persons who have no home in India?

Sardar Swaran Singh: Government has never considered them at par—in fact Government has afforded them greater facilities. There was a time when allotment to general government servants was entirely stopped and all the accommodation was being allotted to displaced government servants. Then they were accorded preferential treatment for a certain length of period, every fifth vacancy going over to a displaced government servant. By adopting these methods the position has greatly improved and as at present advised there is no need for according a preferential treatment. But the matter is still being examined and if anything requires to be done it will certainly be done.

TELEPHONE CABLES FACTORY

*97. **Shri Hukam Singh:** Will the Minister of **Works, Production and Supply** be pleased to state:

(a) how far the construction of a telephone cables factory at Mihijam has progressed up till 31st March, 1952;

(b) when the equipment is likely to arrive on the spot; and

(c) when it is expected to start production?

The Deputy Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri Buragohain): (a) to (c). The construction of Factory and residential Buildings are in progress. The orders for the purchase of plant and machinery have been placed and the equipment is expected to be received by the end of the current year. The factory, it is anticipated, will start production by the middle of 1953.

Shri Hukam Singh: Is the construction to depend entirely on foreign imports or are we purchasing some at present also?

Shri Buragohain: The position is as stated by the hon. Member. We have to depend entirely on imports.

Shri Hukam Singh: What was the amount of foreign exchange that was exhausted on this particular item during the last year?

Shri Buragohain: India's requirements are estimated at a value of about Rs. 80 lakhs in a year.

Shri Hukam Singh: Is the contract with the Standard Telephone Cables Company simply for the construction of this factory or would they have any further interest in the running as well?

Shri Buragohain: According to the agreement the consultants will prepare the drawings, designs and estimates etc., for the erection of the factory, supervise its erection, provide engineers at their cost for initial construction period and take special responsibility for putting into service the plant and machinery erected. They will also supply technical information required for the manufacture and train Indian personnel in their works in the United Kingdom.

Shri A. V. Thomas: Is it the intention of the Government to instal telephones and provide public call offices in all the post offices in India?

Shri Buragohain: How does it arise out of this question?

Shri A. C. Guha: Will it be a purely Government factory or the Standard Telephone Cables Company will also have some interest in it?

Shri Buragohain: It will be a purely Government factory, but the company will earn some royalty on the sales.

Shri A. C. Guha: What will be the rate of the royalty?

Shri Buragohain: Two per cent. on the sales.

INDIANS PENALISED IN SOUTH AFRICA

*98. **Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state the number of Indians who have so far been penalized by the Government of South Africa for participating in the passive resistance movement against the Apartheid policy of that Government?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Shri Satish Chandra): Accordng to the Government of India's information, the proposed passive resistance movement by the African National Congress and the South African Indian Congress has not yet started, though meetings and demonstrations were held by these two organisations on the sixth April, 1952, in different parts of South Africa. to record their protest against racial laws.

पंडित ए० आर० शास्त्री : क्या सरकार कृपा करके यह बतायेगी कि दक्षिण अफीका में भारतीयों के प्रति जो दुर्व्यवहार हो रहा है उसको रोकने के लिये सरकार ने कोई कार्यवाही की है या नहीं, और अगर की है तो क्या कार्यवाही की है ?

[**Pandit A. R. Shastri:** Would the Government be kind enough to inform the House whether they have taken any steps to prevent the bad treatment being meted out to Indians in South Africa; if they have taken any steps, what are they?]

श्री सतीश चन्द्र : यह एक दूसरी गवर्नमेंट का मामला है । वहां के लोगों की जो स्ट्रगल है गवर्नमेंट आफ़ इंडिया की मारल सपोर्ट ही उसके साथ हो सकती है ।

[**Shri Satish Chandra:** Another Government is involved in the matter. The Government of India's moral support is with the people's struggle there.]

सेठ गोविन्द दास : जो आन्दोलन दक्षिण अफीका में चल रहा है उसकी निस्बत क्या भारतीय सरकार के पास वहां की कांग्रेस समय समय पर कोई रिपोर्ट भेजती है और इस रिपोर्ट से क्या इस बात का भी पता लगता है कि वहां के इस आन्दोलन में वहां के मूल निवासी कितनी दूर तक भाग ले रहे हैं ?

[**Seth Govind Das:** Does the South African Indian Congress send any reports to the Government of India in connection with the movement going on there? If it does, do the reports mention as to how far the indigenous population takes part in that struggle?]

प्रधान मंत्री (श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू) : भारतीय सरकार का वहां की कांग्रेस से सीधा कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है, और न कोई रिपोर्ट उसकी कांग्रेस से मिलती है। हमारे वहां एक एजेंट रहते हैं। एक सेक्रेटरी, और उनके जरिए से वहां की खबरें आती हैं।

[**The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** There is no direct contact between the Government of India and the South African Indian Congress, nor do we get any report from that organisation. We have an Agent and a Secretary stationed in South Africa, through whom we get news about the situation there.]

सेठ गोविन्द दास : क्या इस सम्बन्ध में भी कोई खबर प्राप्त हुई है कि वहां के मूल निवासियों का इस आन्दोलन में कितना भाग है?

[**Seth Govind Das:** Has any news been received as to how far the indigenous population takes part in that movement.]

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : ऐसी हजारों खबरें आती हैं, अखबार के ज़रिये से, एजेंट के ज़रिये से जो खबरें आती हैं, वह सब आती हैं।

[**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** We get lots of such news, through newspapers, also through our Agent.]

डा० रामसुभाग सिंह : अभी वहां की इंडियन कांग्रेस के सभापति श्री दादू के विरुद्ध वहां एक आर्डर जारी किया गया है कि वे वहां की अफ्रीकन कांग्रेस के सभापति के पद से त्यागपत्र दे दें और उन का मूवमेंट दो वर्ष के लिये केवल ट्रांसवाल में ही रहे, तो क्या इससे यह माना जा सकता है कि वहां के पैसिव रजिसटेंस मूवमेंट को रोकने के लिये यह आर्डर जारी किया गया है ?

[**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** The President of the South African Indian Congress, Shri Dadoo has recently been ordered to resign from the Presidentship of the African Congress and to confine his movements to Transvaal only, for two years. Can it be taken to mean that the order has been issued with a view to check the passive resistance movement there?]

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : इसके समझने में तो कोई तेज़ दिमाग़ की जरूरत नहीं है कि वहां की हुकूमत की तरफ़ से इसको रोकने की कोशिश की जा रही है।

[**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** One does not require a keen mind to realise that the Government of that country is trying to stop this movement.]

REGISTRATIONS AT EMPLOYMENT EXCHANGES

*99. **Shri Velayudhan:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of employees in the various categories registered with the Employment Exchanges of Ernakulam, Calicut and Trivandrum respectively;

(b) the number of persons who got employment; and

(c) whether any complaint was received from the public regarding the working of these Employment Exchanges?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) The number of employment-seekers on the Live Registers of the Employment Exchanges at Ernakulam, Trivandrum and Kozhikode at the end of March, 1952 were :

Category	Ernakulam	Trivandrum	Kozhikode
1	2	3	4
Technical	458	713	314
Clerical	1448	1021	1445
Unskilled	1948	4580	2201
Others	509	426	494
TOTAL	4363	6740	4454

(b) The number of persons placed in employment by these Exchanges were :

Ernakulam.—991, during the period May, 1950—March, 1952.

Trivandrum.—626, during the period May, 1950—March, 1952.

Kozhikode.—20,504, during the period December, 1945—March, 1952.

(c) Yes. Two complaints regarding the Exchange at Trivandrum and two regarding the Exchange at Kozhikode were received during the period January, 1951 to March, 1952. No complaint was received regarding the Exchange at Ernakulam during the same period.

Shri Velayudhan: May I know what action the Government have taken on the complaints received from the Trivandrum and Kozhikode Exchanges?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: The complaint received from Trivandrum was found to be justified and the staff have been suitably dealt with. As regards Kozhikode the matter is still being investigated by the Regional Director.

Shri Velayudhan: May I know whether the Government is in a position to give the nature of the complaints?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: Yes. The complaint in Trivandrum was that replies to communications were much delayed. The complaint in Kozhikode was that the individual concerned was not considered for a reserved vacancy.

Shri Velayudhan: May I know whether there was any complaint regarding the corruption in these labour exchanges by the officers?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: There was one complaint that persons who came with chits or recommendations were given preferences. This was investigated, but not much truth was found in it. The complaint was on account of the fact that the complainant was not getting assistance. Since then he has found employment.

Shri Velayudhan: May I know whether the Employment Officer at Ernakulam is refusing to register names in that particular exchange?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: That complaint has not come to our notice.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Would the hon. Minister give the figures registered with employment exchanges throughout India for the last four years?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: That can be supplied.

Mr. Speaker: Instead of putting that as supplementary question, she might put a separate question.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Are there any exchanges for agricultural labourers in rural areas?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: These exchanges are intended for skilled workers and agricultural workers are covered by them.

Shri Nambiar: May I know whether after repeated applications for renewal, the age bar of 25 years is brought in to deny employment to the applicants?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: No, Sir. Only those who do not send their renewal applications are not kept on the live register. As regards other things, it is not the concern of the Employment Exchange, but of the employing authorities.

Mr. Speaker: Now, we will proceed to the next question.

HEALTH INSURANCE SCHEME

***100. Shri Velayudhan:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) the progress of the Health Insurance Scheme launched recently;

(b) what facilities were arranged for the medical examination of employees and whether any fee was levied from employees for this; and

(c) whether the allopathic system of medicine alone is recognised for the purpose of medical examination and granting of Certificates?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) The Employees' State Insurance Scheme was introduced in the State of Delhi and in the Kanpur area of Uttar Pradesh with effect from the 24th February, 1952. A statement showing the progress made has been laid on the Table [*See* Appendix I. annexure No. 26.]

(b) All employees working in factories to whom the Scheme applies are accepted as insured persons without medical inspection or examination and, therefore, the question of levying fees does not arise. For Medical treatment and attendance of such insured persons, the following arrangements have been made:

Delhi.—Eight State Insurance Dispensaries and one Mobile State Insurance Dispensary for outlying places have been set up. In addition, arrangements have also been made at three existing Government Dispensaries for treatment of employees during specified hours each day.

One Panel Medical Practitioner has been appointed for Delhi Cantt.

Kanpur.—Thirteen State Insurance Dispensaries have been established. Two Mobile State Insurance Dispensaries for outlying areas are also being provided.

At these Dispensaries insured persons receive out-patient treatment and medicines, injections and dressings. Doctors also visit insured persons at their houses when necessary. Indoor hospital treatment is provided in serious and emergent cases. No fees whatsoever are charged for Medical treatment admissible under the Scheme to the insured persons.

(c) Only Insurance Medical Officers appointed under the Scheme are entitled to grant medical certificates, and since they are allopaths under the present arrangements, only the certificates issued by them are recognised.

If a substantial number of workers demand treatment by the Indian systems of medicine and the State Governments have recognized the qualifications in such systems, treatment facilities will be provided under those systems as well. The certificates issued by duly appointed medical practitioners under those systems, in respect of persons treated by them, will also then be recognised.

Shri Velayudhan: May I know whether there was any persistent demand to recognise certificates from Ayurvedic doctors regarding treatment?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I have answered that question in the last portion of the answer. But, we have not yet received any persistent demand.

Shri Velayudhan: May I know whether there was any demand at all from the employees, though not persistent?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: So far as our information goes, we are informed by the Delhi State Government and the U.P. State Government that a majority of workers wanted to be treated by the allopathic system and I have further replied that if at any stage it was found that a substantial number of workers demand treatment by the Indian systems, facilities will be provided for that.

Shri H. N. Shastri: Are Government aware that for all diseases requiring patent medicines and injections, the employees are required to spend their money?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: It might be the case in the case of very costly medicines. The arrangement at present is that the employers will have to bear that cost.

Shri Dhulekar: May I know whether the Government has issued any circular that Ayurvedic practitioners who are registered under the law might also be permitted to be consulted by these people?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: As I have said, if a substantial number of workers desire to be treated by the Ayurvedic system, that facility will be provided.

Shri H. N. Shastri: Are Government aware that since the inauguration of the scheme, workers have been experiencing increasing difficulties in getting leave?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: That fact has come to our notice and I understand the Labour Ministry is considering the question of suitable amendments to the Act.

Shri Velayudhan: To how many employees were cash benefits given and what is the amount given till now?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I think it is too early to give any figure. We have not yet got the figures.

Shri Velayudhan: May I know.........

Mr. Speaker: We will go to the next question.

Shri Velayudhan: One question, Sir: it is very important.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

AID TO NEPAL

***101. Shri B. R. Bhagat:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Nepal Government has sought India's aid for Nepal's development;

(b) if so, in what form and on what basis;

(c) the extent of the aid; and

(d) whether the Government of India has agreed to grant a loan to Nepal?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) to (d). Yes. The information asked for was given in a Press Note issued by the Government of India at the end of last month. A copy of this Press Note is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix I, annexure No. 27.]

Shri B. R. Bhagat: May I know whether, apart from the loan, the Nepal Government Mission that visited India recently, gave a programme of economic developments in which both the Nepal and the India Governments are interested and asked for some grant on *ad hoc* basis?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There has been no recent Nepal Government mission unlesss the hon. Member is referring to the Prime Minister of Nepal coming here about 6 weeks ago or two months ago. If that is so, it is true that when they came they discussed a development programme for Nepal and wanted a loan from India. That is exactly what the Press Note, that we issued, deals with.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: May I know whether the Government of India has agreed to finance the Nepal Government on the project to link the Indian border with Katmandu by road and to develop the Katmandu air strip, and whether the Government of India has agreed to finance that on an *ad hoc* basis, apart from the loan?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Government of India have agreed to assist in the building of the road from India to Katmandu and to improve the existing air strip, the landing place in Katmandu. They are doing it, in fact, and that will be debited to the loan.

CLOTH AND YARN

*102. **Shri B. K. Das:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) what is the position of control on cloth and yarn after the introduction of the recent modifications;

(b) what results have been achieved by the modifications; and

(c) how many licences for export of cloth or yarn and for what quantities and value have been granted since the introduction of the modifications?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) to (c). A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix I, annexure No. 28.]

Shri B. K. Das: May I know whether any modification regarding the export of handloom cloth has been made?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Not that I am aware of.

Shri B. K. Das: May I know whether the export policy recently introduced has resulted in any rise in the price of coarse and medium cloth?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The latest variation in these control orders has taken place on the 17th May. It is too early to say whether it has influenced the prices in any way.

Shri B. K. Das: It is stated in the statement as a result of the modifications introduced, cloth and yarn has been moving satisfactorily to the States in spite of the failure of the State nominees to lift quotas. The reason for the failure of the State nominees is given. What are the reasons for the success of the mill nominees in this respect?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: This is a question in which one has to presume certain factors. Naturally, when mills choose their own channels of trade, perhaps they choose persons better fitted for the distribution of cloth than the State nominees. It is a matter in which I am not able to give any categorical answer.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: Have any representations been made to the hon. Minister by the handloom weavers in Salem—a recent Conference was held there—that facilities ought to be afforded for the export of handloom cloth to other countries?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: There is no ban now; the facilities are there. In regard to the specific representation from Salem, I cannot say just now that I have seen it. But, representations from handloom weavers' organisations are pouring in and the matter is now being considered in all its aspects. So far as exports are concerned, they are free. The question really is how to stimulate exports. In spite of their being free, they do not seem to be taken advantage of either by the exporters in this country or by importers in other countries.

Shri B. K. Das: Is it contemplated that the whole distribution system will be left to the mills and will be taken away from the State nominees?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If the hon. Member had perused the statement he would have found that the present relaxation is purely tentative and is confined to the months of April and May. We are really feeling our way and these relaxations have been made, because of a possible glut in the market. Up to the moment the results seem to be fairly good. As to what the Government would do in the future depends very largely on conditions as they exist when the position is reviewed, *i.e.*, before the period when the concessions given lapse.

INDO-PAKISTAN AGREEMENT OF 1950

*103. **Shri B. K. Das:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether in response to protests made by the Government against measures taken by the Government of East Bengal or of Pakistan in contravention of the Delhi Agreement of April, 1950 any action has so far been taken by them to remedy the grievances of minorities there;

(b) when was the last protest made and about what matter; and

(c) whether efforts are still being made to observe the agreement fully?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) I am afraid a categorical reply to this question is not possible. All that I can say is that in a few cases of individuals and, also, in some matters of minor importance, grievances have been redressed by the Pakistan Government as a result of the Government of India's representations. In many important cases, however, no action has been taken, or the action taken has been unsatisfactory.

(b) Protests or representations are made whenever cases requiring such action are brought to the Government of India's notice. The last occasion when a protest was made in regard to a matter of general importance was in August 1951. The protest was about certain discriminatory measures taken by the Government of East Bengal against the minority community. After several reminders, a reply was received in February, 1952, from the Pakistan Government, that the matter was still under investigation.

As regards part (c) of the question, the answer is yes, except in so far as the new question of having passports is concerned, which is a matter apart from this.

Shri B. K. Das: May I know whether in regard to matters in which the replies of the Pakistan Government have been unsatisfactory, those matters have been left at that stage or any procedure has been adopted to resolve the differences?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The normal procedure in regard to matters affecting border questions is for local officials on each side of the border to meet. They go by the name of Commissioners or some such officials. As regards other troubles the procedure is for the Chief Secretaries to meet and for other matters of greater moment the Governments address each other and my hon. colleague Mr. Biswas represented in these matters. The procedures are good enough and there is no difficulty about them. The point is that the results obtained from those procedures are not always satisfactory and often tend to be postponed. If my hon. friend wants to know what other procedure we should adopt to get results I am unable to tell him that here and now, because this is a matter between two Governments. Apart from diplomatic procedures there are no other processes which are easily available.

Shri B. K. Das: Are the minority commissions, which had been entrusted with the task of looking after the implementation of the agreement, functioning still?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: My own impression is that they are not properly functioning. They are there but they do not really function for long periods.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Will the hon. Prime Minister tell us the total number of occasions when protests were lodged by the Government of India either with the Government of East Bengal or the Government of Pakistan in respect of the contravention of the Delhi Agreement?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I could not give the total number straight off.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Can he give us approximate idea?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They vary. The Government of India's protests are relatively limited to important matters. Our Minister in charge of minority affairs is continuously in correspondence pointing out this or that. It is difficult to remember those things. The East and West Bengal Governments deal with each other. There are so many ways of protesting and replying to each other. It is rather difficult suddenly to give an answer to the question.

Shri A. C. Guha: Have the Government of India conveyed to the Pakistan Government the fact that the introduction of the passport system would be tantamount to a repudiation of the Delhi Pact?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, that was the position that the Government of India took up and the Pakistan Government did not accept it and said it was not so.

CLOTH ALLOTMENT

***104. Shri S. N. Das:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether cloth requirements of different States have been received by Government;

(b) whether allotment of quotas has been made to them; and

(c) if so, to what extent requirements of various States have been met giving the figures of allotment in each case?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). Monthly cloth quotas for the States were fixed in December 1948 on the basis of their population. Actual allotments of cloth to the States in a particular month depended on the availability of cloth for controlled distribution in that month. No separate figures of requirements are received from the States.

(c) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House giving figures for January, February and March. [*See* Appendix I, annexure No. 29].

From April onwards controlled distribution has been relaxed owing to failure of State nominees to lift their quotas. All fine and superfine, and 80 per cent. of coarse and medium cloth can now be sold by mills to buyers of their own choice.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know whether in the monthly allotments made in 1952 specifications were made regarding coarse and medium cloth and releases were made accordingly?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am sorry I have not got the breakup of the figures.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know whether efforts have been made to ascertain the requirements of coarse and medium cloth?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The position is that the percentages have changed from time to time in regard to the output of coarse and medium and fine and superfine cloth. The output of medium cloth is perhaps the highest and I believe that these changes have been effected from time to time according to the demand from the various States. I am not in a position to say whether there has been any particular investigation and a variation of production because of that fact or a variation in the allotment, because of such a demand or as a result of such an investigation.

Shri S. N. Das: The Minister has said that no requirements had been received from the various States. If so, what is the basis on which these allotments are made?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The answer to parts (a) and (b) of the question indicates the basis. Actually the basis is the population figures and for the purpose of calculating the population the figures are based on the 1941 Census. A revision would be made when the new census figures are available.

सेठ अचल सिंह : क्या माननीय मंत्री को मालूम है कि ज़्यादातर स्टेट नौमीनीज ने अपना कोटा उठाना बन्द कर दिया है ?

[**Seth Achal Singh:** Is the hon. Minister aware that most of the State nominees have stopped lifting their quotas?]

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If it is a question of the state nominees not lifting the quotas, that is a fact. By and large, with very few exceptions, the State nominees refused to lift their quotas. I believe I answered a question about it the other day.

Shri T. N. Singh: Is it a fact that the State nominees have been unable to lift their quotas because according to the quotas they should compulsorily take a quantity of fine and superfine cloth?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: At the moment it is not a fact because other arrangements have been made in respect of superfine and fine cloth, but it might have been in the past.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: May I know what the effect of this relaxation is?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Well, as I said before, we do not know anything about the general effect of the relaxations made on the 17th May but from various reports which we have received the goods are moving and very possibly—I am just hazarding a guess—we might tide over a possible crisis that was approaching, so far as the near future is concerned.

Shri Nambiar: May I know why Government are not encouraging the production of coarse and medium cloth for the use of the vast masses?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am unable to accept that proposition.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: May I know, Sir, if the removal of control to the extent of 80 per cent. over coarse and medium cloth and permitting the mills themselves to sell cloth to their own nominees is a first step in the process of removing the control altogether?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Well, Sir, if the hon. Member draws any conclusions which will have a lasting bearing on control policy I think he is mistaken. As I have said before, the present removal of certain type of controls is for a limited period and therefore is of a tentative character. If conditions continue as they did before the relaxation was made, well, perhaps the period might be extended. In any event Government have not decided on any policy of decontrol and I can say nothing more about it now.

INDIAN AND FOREIGN UNDERTAKINGS

***105. Shri S. N. Das:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of the Government of India has been drawn to the resolution passed by the twelfth Annual Conference of the All-India Manufacturers' Organisation regarding modification of Government's policy of non-discrimination between foreign and Indian undertakings;

(b) if so, whether the question has been reviewed since then; and

(c) whether there has been any change in the policy since then?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). No, Sir.

Shri S. N. Das: What are the important features of the policy of non-discrimination adopted by the Government that these All-India Manufacturers require modification of ?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The position is, the Government every day gets copies of resolutions passed by bodies of varying importance, and I think it is almost an impossible task if whenever a resolution is passed by any body and communicated to Government the Government sits down to review its policy in relation to the contents of that resolution. I would therefore refer the hon. Member to the existing policy of the Government as indicated in the Government of India's Resolution on industrial policy dated 6th April, 1948 and amended or amplified by the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister on April 6th, 1949 in regard to foreign capital.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know to what extent the adoption of this policy of non-discrimination has been able to attract foreign capital in this country?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I would require notice.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: May I know whether Government have a definite policy of encouraging Indian industries and what is their policy so far as foreign capital is concerned?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: In regard to the first part of the question the Government are always ready to do whatever is in their power to encourage Indian capital going into industries. As regards foreign capital the present policy is covered by those two documents, the Government of India's industrial policy statement and the Prime Minister's statement in regard to foreign capital.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know whether it is a fact that the adoption of this policy has made Indian capital shy and scarce?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am unable to accept that proposition.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: May I know whether Government have received any applications from South India for the starting of certain big industries in that area for which we understand Government have not given support?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The particular question does not arise in regard to the one that is being answered, but if the hon. Member would point out any specific instance where the Government has not given due encouragement to entrepreneur from South India I am prepared to look into it.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: May I know if the documents referred to by the hon. Minister do not refer to the policy of the Government with regard to foreign companies incorporated in India, that is invitation to foreign companies which are operating in India?

Mr. Speaker: That would be more or less a matter of opinion.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: What I want to know is whether companies which had invested capital in India but are incorporated in foreign countries are being encouraged to compete with Indian concerns.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am not able to understand the purport of this question but I would nevertheless say that the position is somewhat different in regard to companies which are already established. What these two statements refer to are in regard to companies that have been sought to be established after 1948 and 1949. So, if the hon. Member has in mind companies which were established earlier the policy indicated would not apply to them.

CLOSURE OF MILLS

*106. **Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some cloth mills of Western India had expressed fear of the closure of the mills because of water scarcity; and

(b) if so, where those mills are located?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). Four Mills of Western India have given notice of closure because of water scarcity. One is in Jalgaon, the other at Baroda, and two in Bhavnagar. None of these four has actually closed.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether any arrangement has been made by the Central Government or the State Governments to remove the water scarcity in those mills?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: These mills have merely given notice but they continue to work. Apparently the scarcity is not so acute.

Shri Kasliwal: Is it not a fact that certain mills have closed down for want of power instead of water supply?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Maybe.

DEVELOPMENT OF ASSAM VILLAGES

*107. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the pilot project for development of Assam villages has been launched;

(b) if so, when and where;

(c) what is the primary object of the Scheme; and

(d) how the expenditure of the Project will be met and how long it will take to complete the Scheme?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) and (b). I presume the hon. Member is referring to Community Projects. Assam has been allotted two Community Projects, one in the Cachar District and another in the Darrang District, and two development blocks in the tribal area. Work on these is expected to commence early in October in time for the Rabi season.

(c) The central object of a Community Development Project is to secure the fullest development of the material and human resources of the area. The attainment of this object in rural areas demands urgent measures for a rapid increase in food and agricultural production.

(d) Expenditure in foreign currencies will be met through allotments from Fund A under the Indo-U. S. Technical Cooperation Agreement. Rupee expenditure will be met partly by the Central Government from the Special Development Fund, called Fund B, and partly by State Governments. It is expected that work on the projects will be completed in three years.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know what other development projects for villages are to be launched by either the State Governments themselves or in co-operation with the Central Government?

Shri Nanda: There is another project under an agreement reached with the Ford Foundation and that was expected to start in February this year.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May we know whether Government contemplate to take the assistance of non-official bodies in the execution of these works?

Shri Nanda: Yes, Sir, in as large a measure as possible.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: May I know what kind of work the Ford Foundation propose to contribute in this area?

Shri Nanda: In those projects, work of practically the same nature but of a restricted kind is going to be carried out—it will be mostly agricultural extension work.

Shri Brohmo-Choudhury: May I know whether such projects will be worked in hill areas of Assam?

Shri Nanda: These two are in the hill areas.

Shri Brohmo-Choudhury: Cachar is not a hill area.

Shri Nanda: What is his question?

Shri Brohmo-Choudhury: May I know whether these projects will be worked in hill areas also?

Shri Nanda: Two development blocks have been reserved for the hill areas.

Jonab Amjad Ali: What about the plains tribal areas? For plains have got tribal areas also.

Shri Nanda: These two development areas are for tribal areas.

Jonab Amjad Ali: Will he mention the names of the areas, whose tribals are going to be benefited by this?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister understands that these projects are in the hill areas. Yes, Mr. Hazarika.

Shri J. N. Hazarika: When will the work be actually started, or has it already been started?

Shri Nanda: The decision taken is that survey for these projects will be completed by the middle of July; project estimates will be furnished by the 31st of July; these will be approved by the 15th of August; and full operations will be started by the 1st of October.

Shri S. C. Deb: Is it under the contemplation of the Government of India to start any such project in the district of Cachar? If so, when?

Shri Nanda: Yes, Sir. We have it in mind.

DOLE TO DISPLACED PERSONS

***108. Shri A. C. Guha:** Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) the weekly or monthly dole given to individual displaced persons residing in camps;

(b) whether recently a ceiling has been fixed for each family irrespective of the number of members in the family; and

(c) if so, the reason therefor?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the House.

(b) and (c). Not recently. Ceiling was fixed more than a year ago to bring relief in camps in line with maintenance allowance in Colonies.

STATEMENT

Doles given in camps to displaced persons from East Pakistan

(1) When given in cash *or* in Kind—

(i) Rs. 2 per week per child below 8 years in cash or its equivalent in kind.

(ii) Rs. 3 per week per adult (above 8 years) in cash or its equivalent in kind.

(2) When given in cash *and* kind—

(i) Rs. 1/6/- per week per child below 8 years in cash plus 1 seer 3½ chattaks of rice and 3½ chattaks of Dal per week.

(ii) Rs. 2 per week per adult (above 8 years) in cash plus 2 seers 7 chattaks of rice and 7 chattaks of Dal per week.

Shri A. C. Guha: May I know what is the ceiling fixed for each family?

Shri A. P. Jain: Ordinarily Rs. 50 and in hard cases up to Rs. 60.

Shri A. C. Guha: Irrespective of the individuals in the family?

Shri A. P. Jain: Yes. Ceiling means that.

Shri A. C. Guha: Has the Government of India received any complaints that this ceiling has been working very hard on them, because some families consist of eight or ten individuals?

Shri A. P. Jain: No.

Shri A. C. Guha: Am I to understand that the Government has not received any complaint?

Shri A. P. Jain: Yes.

LOANS TO DISPLACED PERSONS

***109. Shri A. C. Guha:** Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) at what rate the house building and small trades loans are given to the displaced persons of rural and urban colonies;

(b) whether these loans are given in one lump or in instalments; and

(c) if in instalments, the usual interval between two instalments?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) House building loans in urban colonies are given in accordance with the Government orders issued on the 7th September 1950, a copy of which is laid on the Table [*See* Appendix I, annexure No. 30].

Such loans for rural areas range between Rs. 300 and Rs. 1,000 per family according to the requirements of the particular locality.

Small loans for setting up in business or trade are given in urban areas up to a maximum of Rs. 5.000 and in rural areas up to Rs. 800.

(b) and (c). Loans for business or trade are normally given in a lump sum. Loans for house building are given in instalments and as far as possible in the shape of building materials. Payment of instalments depends upon the progress of construction.

Shri A. C. Guha: Has the Government received any complaint that the intervening period between the two instalments has sometimes been as long as one year or two years?

Shri A. P. Jain: Yes. Some complaints were received, not exactly that the intervening period has been one year but that it has been fairly long.

Shri A. C. Guha: Is it possible to construct a house when the instalments are given at such a long interval?

Mr. Speaker: This is distinctly a matter of opinion. Next Question.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: Question 110.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I understand that this question has been transferred to my colleague the Finance Minister.

Mr. Speaker: I never called Question 110. I was going to call 111, when the hon. Member miscalled 110.

Anyhow, Question 111.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: Yes, Sir.

EFFECT OF SLUMP ON PRODUCTION

*111. **Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state how far the recent slump in the commodity markets has affected the production of commodities?

(b) What steps have Government taken to prevent the adverse effects of the slump on production?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) It is too early to assess the effect on production of the fall in prices of certain commodities.

(b) A close watch is being kept on the situation. Whenever a fall or expected fall in prices results in accumulation of stocks which threaten to hamper production, suitable relaxations are being made in the administration of controls where they exist.

Government have also taken steps to buy cotton at flour prices already announced.

Shri P. C. Bose: May I know whether in the hon. Minister's opinion this is a slight recession in prices or a slump?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is a matter of nomenclature. I do not dispute the right of my hon. friend to call it a slight recession in prices.

Shri Nambiar: May I know whether it is a fact that due to the slump, there is a reduction of working hours and also a reduction of the shifts for the workers in the textile industry in various mills in Bombay. Ahmedabad etc.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: There have been notices of possible reduction of shifts, but no serious reduction has taken place.

Shri Nambiar: May I know the number of employees who are affected or who will be affected within a short time?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: This question has been answered on a previous day. I believe that the number of employees affected either by reason of reduction of shifts or of closure of mills all over India is in the region of 5,000.

EXTRADITION TREATY BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN

*112. **Dr. M. M. Das:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any Extradition Treaty has been concluded between India and Pakistan after India became a Republic;

(b) if not, the reasons why such a treaty has not been concluded;

(c) the total number of persons wanted by India who have fled to Pakistan and cannot be got owing to the absence of an Extradition Treaty; and

(d) the number of persons required by Pakistan from India?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) No.

(b) The Government of India do not think it feasible to enter into any such treaty with the Government of Pakistan for the present.

(c) and (d). Figures are not readily available.

EDUCATIONAL PLAN

*113. **Dr. P. S. Deshmukh:** (a) Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state in outline the plan of educational development finally settled?

(b) If the plan is not ready, by what time is it expected to be finalized?

(c) Is there any amount proposed to be spent on the educational development during the year 1952-53?

(d) If so, what is the amount and on what items will it be spent?

(e) How is the amount proposed to be spent State-wise?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) The Plan of educational development is still under consideration.

(b) The plan is expected to be finalized by the end of June, 1952.

(c) Yes.

(d) There is provision for Rs. 4,37,19,000 in the Budget estimates for 1952-53 of the Central Ministry of Education for the schemes included in the Plan. A statement showing the items on which the amount will be spent is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix I, annexure 31].

(e) The matter is under consideration in consultation with the State Governments.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Am I to understand that this does not represent the final figure and that there is a likelihood of additional funds being made available if the necessity arose?

Shri Nanda: I cannot answer with regard to the likelihood of additional funds. The plan is being revised and anything may happen.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: The figure mentioned in the statement indicates that a very large percentage of the money is to be spent on one or two institutions and on scientific higher education. Is there any possibility of any scheme of adult education and primary education being assisted out of this money?

Shri Nanda: There is provision for education of all categories, and I have got the names of the institutions and the amount sanctioned in respect of each of them.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I have also got them.

Shri Nanda: The amount does not exhaust all the provision that has been made in the plan for the purpose of being expended on education.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Am I to understand that there is not going to be any specific provision for increased facilities for adult education and compulsory primary education? I am asking because the provision made here is very small—it is hardly 15 per cent of the whole amount.

Shri Nanda: Adult education and primary education are primarily to be looked after by the States, whereas this provision relates to specific grants made by the Centre to certain institutions.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TRESPASS INTO INDIA BY FRENCH INDIA POLICE

*114. **Shri P. T. Chacko:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have made any enquiries regarding the allegation that a French India Police Inspector with four armed sepoys and a number of goondas trespassed into Indian territory near Cuddalore on the 12th of April, 1952 and attempted to kidnap certain Indian citizens and if so, with what results;

(b) whether it is a fact that a similar raid was carried out in January 1952; and

(c) whether Government have taken any steps to prevent recurrence of such incidents?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Yes, Sir. We made enquiries into the incident and protested to the French India Government. They deny the allegation.

(b) Yes, we had also protested then to the French India Government and requested them to prevent their police from trespassing on Indian territory.

(c) Besides protesting to the French India Government, we have strengthened our police force on the border.

TENEMENTS FOR DISPLACED PERSONS

***115. Shri Balmiki:** Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state.

(a) the number of tenements for displaced persons which are under construction;

(b) when they would be ready;

(c) the basis of allotment of the tenements to displaced persons; and

(d) how far the interests of Harijan displaced persons will be looked after?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) and (b). Construction of tenements for Displaced Persons is going on at numerous places all over India and the labour and time involved in collecting the required information will not be commensurate with the results achieved.

(c) First priority in the allotment of houses and tenements is ordinarily given to persons who are living in improvised structures by the roadside, or who are squatting on public or Government owned land or who have been living in public or religious places or Government quarters.

(d) About 2,000 tenements have been exclusively built for Harijan displaced persons in Delhi, Ajmer and Ahmedabad. Besides Harijans are entitled to and are getting allotment under general housing schemes like other displaced persons.

MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCE

***116. Shri Balmiki:** (a) Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state the total amount paid to infirm, invalid and old displaced persons in 1951-52 as maintenance allowance?

(b) Are Government aware of the difficulties of grantees of maintenance allowance to present themselves in person or to submit certificates of gazetted officers?

(c) If so, what do Government propose to do in the matter?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Widows and unattached women, minors and other displaced persons who by reason of old age, infirmity, illness or other causes, are unable to make a living for themselves, were paid Maintenance Allowance amounting to Rs. 30 lakhs approximately during 1951-52. Separate figures of payments to the infirm, invalid and the old are not available.

(b) and (c). The procedure prescribed is normal and consistent with considerations of financial propriety. Government do not think that any avoidable inconvenience is involved.

DISPLACED GOVERNMENT SERVANTS FROM EAST BENGAL

***117. Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay:** (a) Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state what is the number of displaced persons migrated to India from East Bengal since 1st January 1952?

(b) How many of them were Government or quasi-Government servants in East Bengal before migration?

(c) What arrangements have been made for the rehabilitation of such Government servants as are referred to in part (b) above who came from East Bengal since 1950?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Over 13,000.

(b) The number of Government or quasi-Government servants among these displaced persons is not known. The collection of this information will entail considerable amount of labour and time which will not be commensurate with the results achieved.

(c) Such Government servants can register themselves with the employment exchanges for the purpose of employment. They are also eligible for the rehabilitation benefits usually allowed to middle class non-agriculturist displaced persons, such as building sites, house building loans and loans for business, trade or industry.

NUX VOMICA (EXPORT)

***118. Shri M. R. Krishna:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether any steps have been taken to export Nux Vomica drug to the United Kingdom and dollar areas?

(b) Which are the other countries which need this drug?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): (a) Export of Nux Vomica is on O.G.L.

(b) Mainly Germany, Malaya, Hongkong and France.

TENDERS FOR ROCK-CRUSHING PLANTS

***119. Shri M. R. Krishna:** (a) Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state whether tenders for the supply of rock crushing, screening and concerting plants for the construction of the 'Maithon Dam' have been received?

(b) If so, how many have been received?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) Yes.

(b) Twenty-three.

FIVE YEAR PLAN (FINALISATION)

***120. Shri Heda:** Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state:

(a) when Government expect to finalise the Five Year Plan; and

(b) the cause for the delay, if any?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) and (b). The Report on the Five Year Plan is expected to be completed by the end of June, 1952.

BALANCE OF TRADE

***121. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the balance of trade position of this country with Dollar Areas during the period July to December, 1951?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): India's Balance of Trade position with Dollar Area during the period July—December 1951, was as follows :

Imports	... Rs. 130·45 crores.
Exports (including re-exports)	... Rs. 75·76 crores.
Balance of Trade.	... Rs. 54·69 crores.

(Figures are provisional and are inclusive of transit trade).

INDUSTRIAL CAPITAL

13. Shri S. C. Samanta: Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the total productive capital employed in different industries in India in the years 1947-48 and 1950-51;

(b) the amount contributed by different States in those two years; and

(c) the highest percentage of increase in capital added by a State since 1947-48?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Two statements showing the position of 29 more important industries at the end of 1947 and 1949 are placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix I, annexure No. 32]. Information for subsequent years is not yet available.

IMPORTS

14. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the value of India's imports during the period July to December, 1951;

(i) from dollar areas;
(ii) from sterling areas; and
(iii) from non-dollar and non-sterling areas?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar):

(*Value in lakhs of Rupees.*)

(i) 1,30,45.
(ii) 2,08,52.
(iii) 1,40,34.

(The above figures are provisional and subject to revision.)

FOREIGN EXCHANGE

15. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state India's earnings from foreign exchange on account of exports during the period July to December, 1951 :

(i) from dollar areas;
(ii) from sterling areas ; and
(iii) from non-dollar and non-sterling areas?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar):

(*In crores of rupees.*)

(i) 75·77.
(ii) 208·41.
(iii) 72·34.

Gazettes & Debates Section
Parliament Library Building
Room No. FB-025
Block 'G'
Acc. No. 25007
Dated 20:11:2014

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Thursday, 22nd May, 1952

The House met at a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(*See Part I*)

9-15 A.M.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

FIRING ON RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion which relates—I am giving the substance of the notice, the original of which is in Hindi, in English—to the firing on the railway employees without due notice by the local authorities on the 25th April, 1952 causing death of two persons and injuries to several others.

I am unable, on the face of it, to entertain this motion. But for the fact, that there are a number of new Members, I would not have taken notice of it. I am mentioning it in the House just to enable them to appreciate the necessary requirements and essentials of an adjournment motion.

In the first place—again I say whatever the nature of the incident may be, however regrettable—there is no basis of urgency in this motion. Obviously the incident took place on the 25th of April and the usual conventional procedure has been, and also the rule, that notice of this motion should have been given on the very first day the session began. A delay of twenty-four hours in giving notice has been considered by previous rulings as a delay which cannot be permitted and it was held by consistent string of rulings that the urgency is lost. That is the first ground.

Then the second ground—the motion itself states, or that is the gist of it—is that the firing was by the local district authorities or the State authorities who have the responsibility for law and order. There is no question of the responsibility of the Government of India in respect of this matter. It is the responsibility of the United Provinces Government and any adjournment motion—if at all permissible—will be a matter for discussion in the United Provinces legislature and not this House.

Then there are other objections, I am not mentioning them as objections, but I am merely stating the facts. On the subject of this firing, a question was tabled in this House by Shri A. K. Gopalan and it was answered on the 20th instant. I allowed the question because it did not raise any question of responsibility. It wanted some information and I thought the Government of India would have the necessary information because some railway employees are concerned. To ask for information is one thing—to move for a debate of that question is quite another. Unless there is some responsibility of the Government there could not be any debate on that question.

Now this question was answered on due date. Thereafter Mr. Gopalan has sent a further communication in which he wishes to raise a half hour discussion under our rules of procedure. He has given the points and I am going to admit his notice only so far as the further information he seeks is concerned. But that is a different matter. The House will have an occasion of having information in regard to the incident, but there will be no question of the discussion of the responsibility.

[Mr. Speaker]

At this stage. I may incidentally inform the House—perhaps new hon. Members may not know—that it is considered to be a contempt of the House and a breach of privilege to give publicity to any notice of motion or question by any Member, unless intimation of its admission is given to the Member. If I mistake not, I think it was yesterday that in the Press there is a mention about Mr. Gopalan's request for raising a discussion. I am not going to take any further step in the matter beyond inviting the attention of Members to this important aspect. Unless a notice is admitted, it is improper to give publicity to it in the press that so and so is going to ask such and such a question, or so and so is going to put this kind of thing or that kind of thing or move this motion or that. It is entirely wrong. It is possible that questions—as it many times happens—which are tabled might not be allowed by the Chair and it is wrong on the part of responsible Members of this House to give publicity to what is not coming before the House.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): It might have leaked from the Parliament Secretariat.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should realise that it is no use casting reflection on the Parliament Secretariat. I can vouch-safe, so far as the Parliament Secretariat is concerned, that it keeps everything secret. It is no use taking cover under that kind of defence. The hon. Member's intervention and defence makes me believe that the source was somewhat on his side. He need not have taken it unless the cap fitted him. I never referred to any person as responsible for it. Most probably the information leaked out from the source which gave notice. I never said that they did it intentionally. I have assumed that, it was ignorance on their part of the parliamentary procedure and I was proceeding on that line. It is really a bad defence and his colleagues will perhaps realise that they should be saved from such a friend when he tries to make a defence by throwing the responsibility on the Parliament Secretariat.

I am unable, therefore, either to entertain, much less, to give my consent to this motion.

SUPPLY OF AGENDA PAPERS TO MEMBERS

Mr. Speaker: According to the present practice copies of the following papers are supplied to Members at their residences and they are requested to preserve copies of such papers and to bring them for use in the Chamber when the respective business relating to such papers is subsequently taken up in the House:

(1) Bills as introduced;

(2) Reports of Select Committees on Bills after presentation;

(3) Lists of amendments to Bills, Resolutions and Motions including lists of cut motions to demands for grants.

There are other papers, mention of which was made a few days back in the Parliamentary Bulletin.

Copies of these papers are not included in the daily sets of papers of Members in the House, but a few copies are made available in the Lobby Office and the Parliamentary Notice Office in order to meet the demands of Members who fail to bring their copies. This system has worked well for all these years and has been very economical. Hon. Members might have noticed that certain papers are always placed on the Members' seats —lists of questions, agenda and some other papers. It was the intention to observe as to what the result of the first experiment was and then to follow it up in regard to other papers also, as a matter of economy. We cannot go on spending and wasting money on paper and printing.

I propose to adopt the same procedure in regard to supply of copies of list of business and list of questions which is followed in the case of Bills and lists of amendments and cut motions. The list of business and the list of questions will continue to be circulated to Members in advance as heretofore but will not be placed again on their *seats* in the House in future. Hon. Members are requested to preserve these copies of agenda papers and question lists and to bring them for use in the House from day to day. Some sets of agenda papers and question lists will also be placed in the Lobby Office; and in case any Member forgets to bring his papers, a set will be supplied to him on request. I end with the hope that Members will not be forgetful in bringing their papers.

Now, we will proceed with the Railway Budget.

PRESENTATION OF THE RAILWAY BUDGET FOR 1952-53

Shri L. B. Shastri (Minister of Railways and Transport): I have the honour to present the railway estimates for the year 1952-53 for the consideration of this House. In doing so, I am only conscious of my limitations, particularly those imposed by the time factor. I have had very little time for preparing myself for the presentation of the budget. I am, however, fortunate inasmuch as that the estimates for the year were considered and reviewed by my able predecessor, Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar, before their presentation to the Parliament in the month of February. I am sure, the House will join with me in paying a tribute to him for his sound commonsense, vision and imagination in putting through comprehensive financial and administrative reforms, the effect of which is being progressively reflected in the improvements visible all round in the management and operation of the Indian Railways.

I do not wish to inflict a long speech. It is hardly necessary. My predecessor had recounted only in February this year, the salient features of the financial administration of the railways during the current year as anticipated in the budget estimates. He had also reviewed the other major aspects of railway operations. The White Paper which was then presented gave a review of the development of rail transport in India, the diverse problems which the railways have had to contend with and the plans which have been initiated to resolve them to enable the Indian Railways to fulfil their appropriate role in the economy of new India. The budget papers circulated to the Members deal in detail with all aspects of railway operation and administration and in particular, the Financial Commissioner's Explanatory Memorandum, as now revised, summaries the whole position. I shall, therefore, confine my observations to the two or three major developments since the presentation of the Estimates in February.

As the Members are aware, the process of integration of Indian Railways and the formation of the six administrative zones was completed on April 14 last with the inauguration in Delhi of the Northern, North-Eastern and Eastern Railways by the Prime Minister. The scheme for welding together the numerous railway systems in India to form one co-ordinated railway system, divided into an adequate number of major zonal administrative units, on the basic considerations of administrative and operational efficiency, as also of ultimate economy had received general support in the country, and the formation of the Southern, Western and Central Zones was welcomed by the States Governments, trade and industry, labour and the public. It is a matter of some regret that the last phase of this great administrative reform, namely the formation of the remaining three zones should have occasioned bitter controversy, sometimes acrimonious in certain quarters. In completing the integration of railways in the Northern and Eastern sectors of India, the Railway Ministry have naturally endeavoured to secure the greatest measure of agreement from the States Governments concerned and the Trade and Industry of these States, keeping all the time in view the paramount needs of administrative and operational efficiency. When the Railway Ministry's tentative plan was circulated in January 1952, various suggestions were received from the States Governments concerned to suit their individual peculiar needs and the requirements of trading and commercial interests in their States. These suggestions were conflicting and not susceptible wholly of reconciliation. The concern of Government was to evolve a plan which, while giving due and appropriate consideration to these representations, would not merely maintain, but improve the operational efficiency and further, preserve the basic principles of regrouping, *viz.*, the economic affinity of contiguous regions and the natural flow of traffic. Any plan which places the over-all needs of the country and the community above all other considerations must necessarily conflict with some purely local or regional preferences and sentiments while synchronizing with those of some others. I am confident that I am voicing the feelings of all the sections of this House—that the people of this young Republic today are capable of rising above narrow, parochial and provincial sentiments and prejudices in the larger interests of the unity, solidarity and prosperity of the nation as a whole (*Hear, hear*). I regret and deplore the suggestion, therefore, that we have sacrificed efficiency, economy and the principles of integration on political and provincial considerations. Ample justification for the decision taken has already been afforded. I trust the House will bear with me if I were to restate some of them, perhaps in a slightly different form.

The North Eastern Railway, as now constituted by the amalgamation of

[Shri L. B. Shastri]

the old O.T. and Assam Railways, is purely a metre gauge system and there can be no question of locating its headquarters at any station other than one on the metre gauge system. Once this position is conceded, as it indeed must be, the only other major issue on which there was a difference of opinion was the inclusion of the Allahabad Division in the Northern Zone.

In connection with the retention of the Allahabad Division in the Eastern Zone, a great deal has been said in the Press and in the various memoranda received by the Railway Board during the last few weeks, allegedly based on opinions like those of the Wedgwood and Kunzru Committees. In arriving at the decision that the Allahabad Division should be integrated with the Northern Railway, Government naturally gave the fullest and the most careful consideration to all such opinions to the extent of their validity in the altered conditions prevailing today. The case for the retention of the Allahabad and Lucknow Divisions and perhaps also the Moradabad Division with the Eastern Railway was urged by some primarily to facilitate the provision of an adequate number of empties to the coalfields The point made by them was that the inclusion of these two or three Divisions in the Eastern Zone would give it elbow room and operational flexibility to achieve this end. The proponents of this view, however, themselves conceded that the combined resources of these three Divisions could not produce more than 400 empties against the 1,000 required daily at Moghalsarai and that only by restricting the loadings of all other commodities in these Divisions. Coal is a basic raw material of all industries and its regulated flow to consuming centres all over India is of the utmost importance to the economy of the country. Any disturbance naturally creates a major all-India upheaval. The East Indian Railway attached. therefore. the utmost importance to this movement and being without any powers over movements beyond its territorial jurisdiction, it resorted to the expedient of restricting loadings in contiguous Divisions to ensure the supply of the required number of empties to the coalfields to avoid any criticism of its administrative and operating efficiency. It has to be considered whether the unified Indian Railways could either take such a limited view or allow this position to be perpetuated by continuing to penalise these Divisions alone for the lapses of the other zones involved in the movements. I do not for a second under-rate the importance of coal movement in the context of our national economy, but I do maintain that this will be better secured by the co-ordination of traffic on an all-India basis and by the realisation by all the zones involved in the movements, of their responsibilities in the matter. On this concept, which logically flows from the recent integration, arrangements have been perfected to secure better and more effective co-ordination. A Deputy Director of the Railway Board is now in position at Moghalsarai. He will be in constant touch with all the zonal administrations and with the Railway Board to ensure the flowback of an adequate number of empties through Moghalsarai into the coalfields. This, however, is being achieved not by penalising any particular Division or section of the Indian Railways, but by an over-all regulation and adjustment of traffic throughout the Railway system. I submit, Sir, that this is undoubtedly an improvement on the arrangements in force before integration.

There has been a certain amount of controversy with regard to the future of the Sealdah Division also. In the tentative plan put forward by the Railway Ministry it was intended that this Division should be attached to the Northern Metre Gauge section to give it an access route to the Port of Calcutta. It was felt at the time that this arrangement would facilitate the flow of traffic both in and out of the Port of Calcutta, even though the attachment of a short Broad Gauge link to an entirely Metre Gauge system was not an ideal operating plan. The business interests of Bengal protested against this provision and the Bengal Government was inclined to support their viewpoint. They were of the opinion that this Division should continue with the Eastern Railway for the unity of the Broad Gauge system in Bengal. After a careful consideration of these representations, Government came to the conclusion that the point made by Bengal should be conceded. On a re-examination and review of the tentative plan, it was felt that for maintaining the uninterrupted flow of traffic to and from the Port of Calcutta, it was necessary to provide for a wider and a more effective measure of co-ordination over all the riverine interchange points of traffic than was envisaged in the original plan. As under no practical scheme could all these points be brought under the control of a single zonal railway, the only effective arrangement was the constitution of a machinery in Calcutta with powers to regulate traffic over all these alternative points, having regard to the capacity available from time to time and in relation to the traffic awaiting movement. An officer of the status of a Director of the Railway Board designated "Director, Rail Movements" is already in position and has taken over-all charge for regulating traffic in this area.

To allay the misgivings in the minds of the staff, I would reiterate the assurance given by the Prime Minister and my predecessor that by reason of the formation of these three zones, there will be no retrenchment and no non-gazetted staff will be transferred without their consent. It is needless for me to state that it will continue to be the constant endeavour of the Railway Ministry to preserve the rights and privileges and the legitimate prospects of all Class III and Class IV staff. The organisational arrangements including the location of offices are, therefore, being adjusted to this end.

May I appeal once more to my friends in this House and outside to bring an objective analysis and appreciation to bear upon this problem of administrative re-organisation? I am confident that on this approach, we will all agree that the measures taken have for their objective the larger interests of the country.

Consequent upon the formation of the three new zonal railways, some changes have had to be made in the Budget showing these new Railways as sub-heads of grants in lieu of their constituent units which appeared as such in the Estimates presented in February last. With the completion of the process of integration of Indian Railways into a single unified undertaking, it has also been considered necessary to make some alterations in the financial and accounting structure of the Railways. Hitherto, the earnings and expenditure were worked out separately for each Railway system in a meticulous manner involving a lot of avoidable expenditure. The reason for this arrangement was mainly historical as each Railway system was originally incorporated as a Company and had both an independent administrative and financial existence. With the completion of integration, the whole conception of the Indian Railway system has changed radically in so far as there is now only one railway undertaking in India, the recently constituted six zones being merely administrative units. A natural corollary to this new concept is that the accounts of the Indian Railways should be compiled for the system as a whole and not for its various constituent units; this would be unrealistic. It has, therefore, been decided to eliminate from the financial accounts unnecessary inter-departmental and inter-railway adjustments, such as adjustments on account of freight charges on carriage of railway stores, including fuel, by rail which inflate the figures, both of earnings and expenditure. Similarly, the adjustments carried out at present between the Railways on account of manufacture, repair and overhaul of rolling stock at workshops of one railway for another are proposed to be discontinued with effect from the current financial year. In consequence of these decisions the gross traffic receipts of the Railways, which were placed at Rs. 298.47 crores in the Estimates presented in February 1952, will be reduced by Rs. 16·31 crores with the reduction of a corresponding amount on the expenditure side.

Since the presentation of the Budget and the passing of the "Vote on account" in February last, the financial position has been further reviewed in the light of later statistical material now available. As a result, it has been found possible to accommodate within the over-all allocation of funds, certain additional works which will accelerate the removal of transport bottlenecks on certain sections of the Railways. It has also been found possible to increase substantially the provision originally made for labour welfare, particularly housing. The Railways have set for themselves a standard of housing for labour at Chittaranjan, which has elicited appreciation as the ideal housing for labour anywhere in India. As the largest employer of labour in this country, it has been the constant endeavour of the Railway Ministry to create conditions of work commensurate with the status of labour in the economic and social life of our welfare State. The House will undoubtedly appreciate that the fulfilment of this new policy throughout the Railway undertaking is a formidable task and has of necessity to be phased over a period of years. We have formulated comprehensive plans for not merely building new houses with improved amenities, but also undertaken the remodelling and renovation of existing houses to bring them up to standard. In this matter, as in many others, we had inherited practices and standard which

[Shri L. B. Shastri]

could no longer be countenanced as being appropriate to the conditions that should exist in our largest nationalised undertaking. In the old Company days, passenger amenities, particularly in the lower classes, were neglected and housing of labour attracted very little attention and was generally considered infructuous expenditure. Some of the colonies which we have thus inherited are, if I may be permitted to quote the Prime Minister, a disgrace to the country. I wish to assure this House that the Railway Board is only too conscious of its responsibilities in this matter. Within the limitations of its resources —material, man-power and financial —plans are being implemented to reproduce standards akin to those of Chittaranjan—over the whole field of railway housing. This attitude finds concrete expression in the large provision made under housing and labour welfare in the estimates.

Before I conclude, I should refer to certain other important developments in the inter-budget period. The House is aware that all the important facets of railway operations are being reviewed by high-powered committees. The Indian Railway Stores Committee has already reported and the Fuel Committee's final report is expected shortly. The principal recommendation of the Stores Committee related to the transfer of procurement responsibility of specialised railway stores to the Ministry of Railways. But before this recommendation could be implemented, it became necessary to secure the acceptance of this by the Works, Production and Supply Ministry and certain adjustment in the existing procurement machinery had also to be carried out. As a result of inter-departmental discussions, it has now been agreed between the Ministries concerned to transfer the procurement of specialised railway stores to the Railway Board. This, it is expected, will result in considerable improvement in the utilization of repair facilities in the railway workshops and in an acceleration of workshop output. Non-availability of adequate quantities of spares and components was interfering with the planning of production, which impediment will now be quickly removed. It has also been agreed that the inspection of specialised equipment will be taken over by technical railway officers, as they are better equipped not merely to accept the work executed as being up to the standard required, but are also competent to allow modifications or alteration of designs to facilitate production within the country. The interim report of the Fuel Enquiry Committee has also been received and the indications are that their final recommendations will result in considerable economy in the fuel consumption of the Indian Railways, thereby giving appreciable savings in the operating expenses.

As has already been announced, the Indian Railways will celebrate its Centenary in 1953. It is proposed to organise a Railway Exhibition at Delhi in connection with the celebrations which will not merely give a historical representation of development of rail transport in this country, but will also exhibit the principal items of railway equipment in use, thus affording industries in India an opportunity of considering the feasibility of establishing manufacture in a large measure than at present. Provision has also been made in the Budget Estimates for the construction of a long overdue appropriate passenger station at New Delhi with all modern facilities for the travelling public, including retiring rooms for lower class passengers.

I thank you, Sir, and the House for the patient hearing given me. Need I assure the House that it will be my constant endeavour to maintain the steady progress achieved in operating efficiency, to foster better and closer relations and understanding between labour and administration and to continue to improve the scale of amenities made available to the travelling public and labour. I am confident that I will receive support and encouragement from this House and from the members of the public outside and the willing co-operation and loyalty of all categories of railway employees, to enable me to fulfil my heavy responsibilities as the custodian of the largest nationalised undertaking.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT—*concld.*

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed with the further consideration of the Motion of Thanks and the Amendments. I believe we have nearly 2 hours or at least 1½ hours to carry on the discussion further.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): I am grateful for the opportunity which I have at last been given to participate in this debate, and I hope, Sir, you will permit me to say that while we on this side of the House had no illusions about the Members of the Treasury Bench—I do not want to say anything about their "colour and complexion"—while we, therefore, were quite prepared for the cynical callousness which characterises the Address, we were not quite prepared for the self-righteous gusto with which spokesmen of the Government have come forward to defend indefensible policies in this House. I refer in particular to my hon. friend. Dr. Katju whom I always associated with the spirit of sweetness and light. I was astonished to see him coming forward to champion certain actions which I am sure can never be found defensible on any civilised standards. I tell you, Sir, and through you the Minister, that they have been driven to this position because they have no other alternative. They have insulated themselves in air-conditioned comfort, away from the conditions of life of the common people and the only course which they can now adopt is to have recourse to repression, and that is why the address shows such cynical disregard of the conditions of life of the people of this country.

We on this side of the House have been the principal targets in this debate. Also aspersions have been cast about our patriotism. And I want to say with a full sense of responsibility that we are Communists because we are patriots, we love every blade of Indian grass, and we ask you on the other side of the House to remember what you have tried to say yourselves about the measure of happiness which you say is the criterion of freedom and independence. I ask you, what is the measure of happiness which we have got for our country after five years of independent administration? And you have come to such a pass that the hon. Minister of Finance gives us what is supposed to be an unvarnished catalogue of facts. He said he was going to pour the oil of facts on the troubled waters of feeling. Possibly I may be carried away, Sir, by feeling, but I cannot help it. But I was astonished to find that the Minister of Finance was not going into the fundamentals of the matter when the President's Address was being debated. He told us: we have this deficit, we cannot meet it; we have got to import foodgrains—that is all there is to it and there will be "some privation". He spoke with a cynical spirit which I could never give credense for. He said even that the condition of the people is very much more favourable because there has been a general fall in prices.

Is the Government denying the fact that today famine stalks the country? They may talk about not having reports from different parts of the country. I will show you a Congress paper from Calcutta which I got yesterday which prints pictures of starving people coming to the streets of Calcutta. It reports the cry of distress which is being heard every day in the streets of Calcutta. It reports facts, sheer unvarnished facts, of people coming from the Sunderban area which is not an arid zone like Rayalaseema—it is a zone which should be flowing with milk and honey if only the Government followed a really fundamental agrarian policy which the Prime Minister used to champion at one time. I am sorry to have to say anything about our Prime Minister, but I fear he has lost his place in history for the lure of a tinsel portfolio. That is a tragedy. It is not merely a personal tragedy. It is a tragedy for the whole country.

But, to come back to the statement of facts. I would like the hon. Minister of Finance to tell me: has he tried to find out why today there is so much fallow land in our country? Will he explain to this House why the Planning Commission has actually said that there is so much fallow land? There are 10 million acres of fallow land in the country. Is it because certain things have happened in Hyderabad? In Hyderabad, the people got hold of the land in order to cultivate it, in order to live by the sweat of their brow, but that land has been taken away from them and it remains fallow? I can give a quotation from the Planning Commission's report in which this very same thing is said. Will the hon. Ministers for Finance and Food and all the other portfolios —and they are there in plenty—will they come forward and tell us why it is that the fundamental economic reconstruction has not happened? Why do we send Cultural Delegations to China, but we do not find out how in two years time China has achieved self-sufficiency in the production of food? If we can get this fallow land under cultivation, if we give to the tenant, the tiller of the soil, his right to the land, if we can abolish the Zamindari system, I am sure the production of food will increase to such an extent that we shall not have the distress we have today.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

In regard to Rayalaseema we have been told that it is a drought region. For four or five years now it has been a drought region. The Government in its soporific condition, the usual condition in which I find the Treasury Benches, remained without doing anything all these four or five years. If Rayalaseema is a drought area, why were not proper steps taken during these four or five years, why was it allowed to continue and why are you coming forward with the proposition that we must put up with it, that you cannot do anything and that we must pray for God's grace, as your good friend Mr. Rajagopalachari in Madras is recommending people to do? (*Interruption*). You cannot deny these things. These are absolute, unvarnished facts. The hon. the Finance Minister said—I give credit to him for frank speaking—he gave a catalogue of facts in a very bureaucratic fashion and said, "Take it or leave it, I cannot do anything. I am wedded to the *status quo* and cannot do anything to change the present situation; let there be a little privation". That is the way in which he has put his case. It is a case which I am sure should not be permitted to be put forward in the forum of the country.

To turn again to another Minister, the Minister of Planning, Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda, he has tried to deny any suggestion of subservience to American capital. I would say that the Minister of Planning is very much in conformity with the spirit of this decorated wilderness, which is the Capital of India, a place where there is pomp without character, where buildings accumulate and men wither and decay. His subject of Planning reminds me of that grin without a cat which Alice saw in Wonderland. What is he planning for? The Planning Commission report says in five years' time, by 1957-58—or God knows when—we might, I do not say we shall, be self-sufficient in food. And what are we going to do about industries? Well, the imperialists, whose mantle the Ministry have inherited and are insensitive to the dirty stink of that mantle, they wanted us to remain as an agrarian hinterland of imperialism, to remain in planned backwardness. And so the Planning Commission comes forward and says in five years' time we shall have, not even a complete motor car, but 25 component parts of a motor car, completed by about 1957! What is all this? It can only be characterised by a word which you, Mr. Speaker, will not permit. But this is the kind of thing which is passing off for planning in this country at a time when in the Soviet Union they are conquering deserts, making places blossom and flow with milk and honey—places which were arid beyond comparison with our arid zones.

An Hon. Member: Why do you not go there?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

10 A.M.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Mr. Nanda has said that there is no subservience to American capital. I will refer to certain clauses in the Indo-American Technical Co-operation Agreement and they are very eloquent in regard to our actual position. In paragraph (4) of article 1 of this Agreement it is said that the Indo-American Technical Agreement Fund will be jointly administered by an American Director of Technical Co-operation and an official of the Finance Ministry of the Indian Government. The Director will, of course, be an American official, appointed by the United States Government, working under the general supervision—not of Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda—but of the American Ambassador in this country, and the American official, the Director, and his staff will have, Mr. Speaker, 'diplomatic privileges and immunities' and our Legislatures and even law courts will have no power over them. This is the specific provision in the Agreement—the Indo-American Technical Co-operation Agreement. This is the kind of ageement which we have made. If this is not subservience to American capital heaven knows what is. And as my hon. friend Mr. Gopalan said, we find these Americans everywhere. We find them prospecting for us; we find them getting into contracts with us. What about the deal with the Standard Oil Company in regard to some oil refineries in Bombay? They are doing it. They are everywhere. They are like the Frogs of Egypt, they sup in our cup, they dip in our dish. You find these Americans lording it everywhere and bossing over the show and telling us how we should plan the future of our country. We are going to plan the future of our country in pursuance of what is going to be told us by the American imperialists who are trying to rule over unwilling peoples not only by the force of the bayonet which is an outmoded instrument but by means also of germ warfare which every tenet of humanity condemns. We say nothing about it, we cannot say anything about it, and our Prime Minister says "we pursue a policy of real, constructive neutralism"—perhaps he does not use that expression but something of that sort: this is the only thing we can do honourably and effectively. I say our Prime Minister has a tremendous opportunity. He is undoubtedly the person who has been invested by more millions of human beings than any other with authority that is unchallenged. He stands in a strategic position of advantage which he ought to use in order to bolster up the peoples struggle from Tunisia and Morocco to Indonesia and Viet-Nam. But we are acting as a matter of fact as the recruiting sergeants of imperialism, recruiting soldiers to go to Malaya and help the British imperialists to practise chemical warfare to demolish the food crops which are being reared by the toil of the Malayan people. We are doing this kind of thing. Our Prime Minister, for whom I have very great respect, whom I do not wish to speak about in terms which might offend, had a tremendous opportunity before him. Here I am reminded of what was said about a very great figure in history in regard to the opportunities which he missed. It is said about Napoleon, with whom of course the Prime Minister should not be compared, that he strutted upon the crest of a mountain of opportunity like a cockerel on a dung hill. I do not wish that our Prime Minister should be reduced to such a position. Let him come forward and tell the world that he is going to fight for those who are now struggling for freedom in the different countries of the world. And when he says that I give you our word of honour that we shall be behind every effort of his to fight for freedom in every part of the globe.

But they cannot do it. The Ministry cannot do it. It is a policy of repression and therefore the things which Dr. Katju had to say had got to be said. Dr. Katju has used a certain document about Communist atrocities; I do not know where it was prepared. We can produce counter documents. But he has put that document on record. He has read certain extracts from it. In view of that I would like you, Sir, to permit me to quote certain facts and figures from our side in regard to the position in Hyderabad, and specially in Telengana. Dr. Katju said, and before that a holy man in sanyasin's robes, Swami Ramananda Tirtha, said all kinds of things about us. I take it he is an honourable man. A suggestion has been made in this House very unequivocally that an impartial Commission may be appointed to go into the matter of the so-called atrocities committed by the Communists in Hyderabad. We are prepared on our side for a Parliamentary Commission or a comparable Commission which is absolutely impartial to go there, find out the facts and then pronounce upon the rights or wrongs of the matter. On behalf of our party I reiterate that suggestion and I call upon the Prime Minister when he rises to speak to say something about this matter to us.

In regard to Hyderabad I would say we have no *mantram*: we have no particular formula which we pronounce before the peasants and the peasants come forward and say: we are with you; we are going to fight till death overtakes us all. We have no such *mantram*. Swami Ramananda Tirtha may be in possession of *mantrams* which he can use, but we have no such *mantrams*. It is only when we link ourselves with the people of our country that we become invincible, and that is a point which I wish Dr. Katju and the Prime Minister to remember; The Communists can succeed in reality when they truly align themselves with the demands of the people. When they can champion properly and effectively what the people desire, it is only then they can succeed. In spite of all the repression against them, they can never be defeated. In Hyderabad exactly that sort of thing has happened and it happened because there was a tremendous agrarian movement, a movement directed against the unspeakable feudal despotism of the Nizam. He was using his Razakars and against that combination of the Nizam and the Razakars, this agrarian movement had developed in such a fashion that over an enormous area the peasants were put in control of the land and the Nizam's henchmen, the Deshmukhs, naturally came in for a certain amount of trouble. Our Prime Minister is a specialist in the history of revolutions and he knows that when a basic change is effected certain excesses are committed from time to time. When you pluck a rose, you cannot always prevent a prick. He would say that the agrarian revolution of this sort which happened in Hyderabad had to be suppressed by spilling blood and in the most ferocious manner by the armies and the Military policemen of the Government of India and that is exactly what happened. In regard to Hy-

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

derabad, the Government started its so-called Police action in September. 1948. Over 2,000 villages the position was such that the peasants had established their own *pancha raj* and in another 1,000 villages which were under the Nizam the administration was entirely paralysed. The day after the Police action began, the military police killed peoples' leader, called Veeraiyah, who was caught and shot dead and then the action continued. Ultimately about 4,000 peasants were killed; 10,000 people were jailed without trial. Concentration camps were set up and are still continuing on the soil of Hyderabad. 170 persons have died inside the jails of Hyderabad largely because of the torture practised on those persons and when Dr. Katju advises: You go to the courts and find out what the courts can do for you, I tell him: I happen also to be a member of the English Bar and I can give the facts. What are the facts? In Hyderabad what happened was that cases were instituted, six months after arrest, then special tribunals were arranged and the Tribunals directed that the defence should be prepared and produced in the course of one day. The laws of evidence were completely disregarded. I would ask Dr. Katju to go to the Supreme Court next door and find out what the Supreme Court judges had to say in regard to the blatantest irregularities practised by the special tribunals, but because of our Constitution, the Supreme Court of India could not intervene in certain cases. In one day, these people were called upon to produce their defence, to get a lawyer to defend the case and the evidence had to be completed in the course of one day. There are umpteen instances of death sentences being pronounced in this way. Some 200 people were condemned to death in this manner and this is the fashion in which the courts were functioning. Not only in Hyderabad but in Kakdwip, West Bengal nearly 135 people were in jail for three years. They were tried by a special court. The matter had to be taken to the Calcutta High Court and then to the Supreme Court of India and they decided that the special courts ordinance was *ultra vires* under Constitution. In spite of this decision of the Supreme Court these prisoners were taken to jail again by another device. The West Bengal Government specialize in all kinds of very extraordinary devices. These prisoners have continued in jail for so long a period in spite of their being supposed to be undertrial prisoners who are awaiting judicial decision of their cases. I can give you other instances also. There was the case of Mr. Aftabuddin, a member of the Electoral college in Tripura. He was elected with a thumping majority. The Congress candidate there got only a minute proportion of the votes. This gentleman who was a candidate himself cast his vote. When he got out of the polling booth, he was arrested and detained without trial and even now Mr. Aftabuddin Member of the Electoral College of Tripura is in detention. This is what happened. When we try to go to the Courts, as Dr. Jaisoorya has stated, it is an almost impossible proposition in an autocracy such as is found in Hyderabad even under the new dispensation and to arrange for the defence of thousands of peasants who are being arraigned on all sorts of very grave charges. The lawyers are in fear and trembling when authority with a big A warns them that they would lose their living if they came forward to defend these communist prisoners. What has to be done Mr. D. N. Pritt had to be called from England and he came at his own expense to India. He came to Hyderabad, he came to Delhi. You, Mr. Speaker might have met him. He came as a result of the invitation sent out to him by Dr. Jaisoorya, as the Chairman of the Telengana Defence Committee. These are some of the facts I place before the House. You start Police action against a genuine peasant movement, whose strength has been proved. If you believe in democracy look at the results of the elections; take the case of Ravi Narayana Reddy. He got the largest number of votes in India during the Parliamentary elections. 90 per cent. of the electorate went and voted in Hyderabad. You cannot say it was an illiterate electorate who were going and voting for chap they did not know. If it was an unthinking electorate, possibly, they would go and vote for the sacred bull, but they came and voted for the communist candidate and Mr. Reddy got the largest number of votes of any parliamentary candidate in this country. The Communists have shown by their spirit and their conduct that in spite of repression, in spite of the fact that today you can got to Hyderabad and find villages razed to the ground, in spite of the fact that there are backward tribes for whom Dr. Katju has so much solicitious affection these backward tribes, like the Koyas and Lambadis.

hundreds and thousands of whom have been transported from their villages and kept in concentration camps the people are against the government. A statement was issued only the other day by Members of Parliament from Hyderabad as well as by Members of the Hyderabad Assembly and in answer to that statement, the Hyderabad Government has not been able to contradict the existence of these concentration camps in Hyderabad where on account of the repressive policy pursued and on account of the links of these backward tribes with the peasant movement, the members of these backward tribes had to be bodily transported away from their villages and kept in these camps of torture and repression. This is the sort of thing which is going on in Hyderabad. I was saying that this is the kind of policy to which the Government had been reduced. This is the kind of policy which is the automatic result of the denial to the people of their natural and legitimate aspirations. This is the result of your denial to the people of their demand for linguistic provinces, for a Vishala Andhra and a redistribution of our provinces, which we can do within the ambit of the present constitution.

I would refer to another thing which Dr. Katju said and that was that the Constitution says something and therefore, you must obey. Last year, if my memory serves me right, an assembly very much less representative than this here had no compunction in amending the Constitution to the detriment of the civil liberties of our people. If the Constitution needs to be amended, the two Houses of Parliament have the right under the Constitution to do so and we tell Dr. Katju: If you are going to interpret a fundamental document like the Constitution of India, take it as a whole. Take the fundamental rights chapter; take the directive principles of social policy and then only, after that you decide if these emergency penal provisions in regard to preventive detention in the Constitution should be retained. If you decide to retain them then, of course, I would say: I am sorry for my country; I am sorry for those who are ruling the destinies of, our country.

Thank you very much; Sir, for the opportunity which you have given me, but I hope that some of my words would go home and I repeat my request for an assurance from the Prime Minister that we shall not be treated any further to such exhibitions of callous cynicality and complacency in regard to the condition of life of the common people and that this Assembly shall be treated with the seriousness that it really deserves.

Shri Raghuramaiah (Tenali): I, like many Members of this House, am new. I am not a dramatic actor nor am I a mono actor nor am I a humorist who buries the seriousness of life under humour. I am a plain simple Congressman come to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

[SHRI M. A. AYYANGAR *in the Chair*]

I was greatly amused to hear the opposition's attitude and the vociferous speeches they have made attacking the most simple and much needed statement made by hon. Dr. Katju. With experience of Andhra Pradesh, I can tell you that we, who have suffered from the ravages of the communists, will ever remember with gratitude the assurance given by him regarding the maintenance of law and order. I come from Andhra Pradesh in which, in a number of districts, people were massacred, ears were cut, eyes were pulled out and whole villages were ravaged by the depredations of the communists. If my learned friends, Barristers on the other side, have got papers from Calcutta, I too am a member of the English Bar and I have got here papers which show with photographs the atrocities that have been committed in Andhra Pradesh. They talk of justifying their attitude in Hyderabad on account of the peasant problem. There is no such problem in Andhra Pradesh and yet they have committed these murders. I would ask them, what right have they to do this kind of atrocity on the peaceful citizens of this country. In the formative period of democracy, the most elementary thing to which any country must pay due regard, is the maintenance of law and order. In this country where millions of our countrymen have suffered and obtained freedom, here is an opposition going about preaching and persuading everybody to disobey the laws, commit murders and loot houses. Is this the contribution which the opposition is to make towards the progress of democracy in this country? They may have problems. So have we. But, to arrogate to themselves the right to represent the people and do that mathematical jugglery of converting a majority into a minority and a minority into a majority, if I may say so, it does not become the opposition. I was amazed to hear, of all speakers, Dr. S. P. Mookerjee

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

attacking Dr. Katju. I really cannot understand what objection can be taken to his plain, matter of fact statement. He has only narrated the atrocities that were committed and emphasised the need to maintain law and order. Of course, the criticism of the opposition has absolutely no limit. They would object even to the foreign policy of our great leader.

In particular, they have objected to the friendly attitude which we have adopted towards the other nations. I may assure you Sir, that we on this side of the House are ever proud of the new chapter in international relations. Here is an era, a new era, threatening a new war, with blocs and Bloc alliances. Students of history will remember how the Triple Alliance of Bismark facilitated the Franco-Prussian war and how the alliance of the Axis powers was responsible for inspiring the German nation to start the second world war. I venture to submit that if these alliances and alignments into blocs is to be continued, there is bound to be another greater war in which the whole civilization of the world will perish. Conscious of this, I submit, our great leader has introduced a new chapter in international diplomacy. It is not the secret diplomacy of the 19th century. It is not a threatening bloc diplomacy of the two blocs. It is a diplomacy of the man who wants to protect every weak and every depressed race in this universe. We have shown enough evidence of that. I thought those friends from the communist benches, who had spoken so vehemently in support of China and Russia, would have one word of gratitude for the great service we have done for China. When the question of the recognition of China came up, it was this country and this great leader that supported the proposition that China should be recognised. If the opposition want to learn anything from the book of democracy, let them look at the way in which the British conduct their foreign policy. There are certain measures in which even the opposition will have to give the Treasury Benches, support. If you want this country to take its great place in the comity of nations, there are certain points, on which, when they coincide with yours, you will have to give your emphatic support. This is not mere oration; this is a matter which comes from the bottom of my heart. I would ask the friends on the communist benches to adopt a new attitude to the Government.

It is sometimes said that this country is following a policy of barren neutrality. I would say, ours is not the indifferent neutrality of a country like Switzerland, but the beneficient and benevolent neutrality of a protecting angel. We look to every nation and try to safeguard its interests. Of course, our attitude is different; our policy is different. We try to do every thing in a friendly way. We do not make enemies. I was surprised when exception was taken to our friendly relations with other nations. We have been friendly with Russia, but that did not prevent us from expressing our abhorrence at their act of aggression in Korea. We have been friendly with America: but that did not prevent us from protesting against the imposition of a hard treaty on Japan. We have taken the side of all the weak nations and tried to protect their interests. You say this is a barren policy. Well, I take very great exception to that, and I am sure every thinking man and every thinking hon. Member in this House will agree with me.

On the question of the British Commonwealth of Nations also, exception has been taken. It has often been said that the Commonwealth of Nations is as strong as steel and is bound by ties which are as light as air. I may tell you, the greatest contribution which this country has made to the Commonwealth of Nations is to make the ties lighter than air. Any moment we can break away from it. We have not recognised the titular headship of the Crown. We have fitted a Republic into the British Commonwealth of Nations. This is the greatest contribution which this country has made in the history of the Commonwealth. I know of one commonwealth which my friends of the opposition would very much like us to enter. That is the commonwealth of the satellite nations behind the Iron Curtain. For that, we are not prepared. We are not prepared to sacrifice our honour we are not prepared to sacrifice our independence newly won and won with such suffering, misery and agony.

On the question of Ceylon, and on the question of South Africa, my friends on the other side have expressed very strong sentiments. Let me assure them that we on this side feel no less. I, coming from Madras, have got every reason to feel and express my great sorrow at the events in Ceylon. It is true that the Ceylonese are our younger brothers. We cannot therefore, be hard on them. But, they have not been very fair to us and I am sorry to say that. I only hope that they will not follow the way South Africa has gone, the way of total destruction of democracy. In South Africa, race prejudice has gone to such an extent that they are prepared to use Parliament as the High Court of Justice, destroying the very foundation of democracy—the separation of the executive, the legislature and the judiciary. Well, Sir, race hatred is always bound to reflect on the persons who hate and there can never be a progressive democracy where there is race hatred.

As regards matters inside this country, reference has been made to Rayalaseema. My hon. friends on the Communist Benches have asked what this Government has done when there has been this drought for five years. That is charge which they should place before the proper quarters, the British authorities who were responsible for that. Just as you can build a speech, you cannot build a reservoir. It does take some time. They have started the Tungabhadra project. They are proceeding at a tremendous pace. I can assure you that if the other projects, which are now under the consideration of the Khosla Committee are executed, there will be no famine in Rayalaseema. That is part of the policy and programme of this Government. I hope the Khosla Committee will consider and give due weight to the Nandi Konda Sidheswaram and other projects which will irrigate lakhs of acres and if they are executed. I am sure, the hard hit areas of Rayalaseema will not suffer, and will not have any more famine.

Coming to the question of linguistic provinces we are all for linguistic provinces; but they must be administratively feasible. I hope that in their desire for the formation of linguistic provinces, my hon. friends on the other side are not really trying to advance centres for the propagation and preaching of their rabid communist creed of the Telangana type.

Some of them have made references to the elections and said that the success they had achieved shows what popularity they have. I have been myself a candidate for the Parliament and I have known the methods adopted by the Communists in Andhra. There is no single ruse to which they had not resorted. The food situation was exploited and even the failure of rain was attributed to the Congress Government. They said that the rains have ceased to come because the Congress Government came into power. The policy of violence they pursued had entered into the realm of the elections also. In the Krishna District in particular I have evidence to show that in many cases they had adopted violent methods to force people to vote for the Communists. It is easy to put on the garb of a beautiful angel here or speak very soothing and comforting words in this august House. I would appeal to the hon. Members on the other side to remember that they must start a new convention. It is no use going on in this great House as if it is a public meeting. They must show a sense of responsibility.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I want to know whether it is a debate on.......

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member does not give in. It is open to an hon. Member to answer any question put to him or give any information asked for. It is equally open to an hon. Member not to give way. The hon. Member who is speaking evidently does not want to give way and I cannot force him to do so.

Shri Raghuramaiah: There is one thing which the hon. Members on the other side do not tolerate and that is the statement of truth. They have said worse things. But we had the decency not to interrupt them and I hope they will extend to us the same courtesy. We are not behind the Iron Curtain here. Our cards are on the Table, whether they relate to the national or the international field. They have no business to gloat over the *(Interruption)*.

Mr. Chairman: There is nothing unparliamentary in the words used by the hon. Member. He said that outside, they had spoken a number of falsehoods during the election campaign. If he says in this House hon. Members are liars then I would require him or ask him to withdraw it but it is not so.

Shri Raghuramaiah: I being a barrister cannot give expression to unparliamentary words but I have heard many expressions from the other side which I in my generosity have forgiven. Some people on the other side got up and said that there was no authority for the atrocities committed by the Communists. I was one of the Secretaries to Madras Government about the time when the atrocities were committed. But for the firm action which this Government took we in Andhra would have been totally removed from the surface of the land. In every village there was fear and terror. There were village committees and day and night people had to keep watch. Is this what you call freedom of speech or freedom of action? If this is the freedom that

[Shri Raghuramaiah]

you suggest to us, then woe unto freedom, we will have none of it. Freedom must be real freedom you want the freedom to kill. We want the freedom to live and to propagate our ideals of non-violence.

Shri S. K. Patil (Bombay City—South): This is almost the fag-end of the debate and I must necessarily content myself by referring to a few broad points that have emerged out of this debate on the President's address. It must be remembered that this is the first representative parliament after we have achieved our freedom and besides the jubilation and pride that are justifiably ours, we have got a sacred responsibility towards the people and to this House for establishing conventions and creating traditions, which succeeding Parliaments and generations to come will follow willingly and automatically. What beginnings we have made in this direction is a matter to be seen.

I will begin with a point which in my opinion is a constitutional one. Many Members from the Opposition benches have found fault with this address on the ground that it is not complete, it is imperfect; it is suffering from many defects. There seems to be a fantastic notion in the minds of people that the President's address ought to be an encyclopedia or a catalogue of all the fortunes and misfortunes of a country and not a single fortune or misfortune must be kept out of it. Where they got this notion from I do not know.

The President's address has a meaning in Parliamentary democracy and those who are acquainted with parliamentary democracy do know what it should contain. We have borrowed this procedure, if I may be permitted to say so, from the British Parliament. For the last 25 years I have been watching the King's address to Parliament. These addresses are not any pronouncement on fundamental things: they are not expected to be so. They are really an outline of the legislation which the Parliament is going to tackle during that session and they contain reference to a few outstanding incidents which are before the country. If we have followed this British model we have done so because it is the best model. Our President has referred, and very rightly so, to the legislation under contemplation and he has also referred to some outstanding events in the internal and international spheres. Therefore, if an hon. Member may not find a reference to this or that particular thing, that is not a fault of the address.

This brings me to another tall claim made by some of the stalwarts of the Opposition, equally fantastic in my view. They say, here you are a Government elected only by 47 per cent. of the electorate and therefore like Louis XIV the rest is theirs. The balance 53 per cent. belongs to them. I would have even admitted that claim if there was one party in the Opposition but it is a very delightful sight to see the Opposition's composition. It consists of all the colours of the rainbow plus a few more. And these people whose opinions are so diverse, with principles equally diverse, claim that all the 53 per cent. belong to them. That is something which I do not understand. My friend Dr. Mookerjee and Mr. Chatterjee perhaps unwittingly gave the credit to the Congress "You with 47 per cent. of voters have managed to get such a large majority of 70 per cent. in the House". If it is a tribute to the Congress election machinery that with 47 per cent. of votes they have managed to get such a thumping majority, I do not know what the Prime Minister will have to say about it but as a humble back-bencher of this party I humbly accept that tribute with proformed gratefulness. That is the experience of parliamentary democracy in all countries, except in Russia, where I understand people are elected with 99·99 per cent. of votes. That wonderful phenomenon none would find anywhere except in some of the Iron Curtain countries. In England, for instance, the Conservative Government or the Labour Government have come into power with the so-called minority vote. Even in the United States of America with the emergence of a third Presidential candidate the contest is now widened and you find that the Democratic Government very often comes into power, or even the Republican Government for that matter, by what you call the minority vote. But it is not the minority vote here. If there were only two parties you would have found that there would have been a thumping majority even in the percentage of the Congress votes.

Now I come to analyse the points which the Opposition have raised. My friend, Shri Gopalan, the floor leader of the Communist Party began his speech by saying that the President's address is a declaration of war on the people. Even in words they cannot eschew violence, what in action? this is a declaration of war. You know, Sir, very well that it is a time-honoured political maxim from Plato to Mahatma Gandhi that man-made institutions, whether they be Parliaments or any other cannot in their character or standards be very much higher than the men who make them. Here you are people, not only finding fault with the Government but doing many other things to which I shall refer later, and you expect your Government to be par excellence, so ideal, angelic, while you will not be angelic, you will not be ideal, you will have an underground parallel Government. I am amazed, Sir, that this challenge should be thrown on the floor of the House that a Commission should be appointed to judge between the Government established by law and the underground Government. I have never heard such a claim. Could anybody in his senses make a claim of that nature? I can understand it if there are two outside parties and you approach the Government with the suggestion to appoint an impartial commission. But here the claim is that just as you are the Government established by law we are also the underground Government established by what law I do not know—established by lawless law—therefore, between the two if justice is to be done a commission has got to be appointed! I do not understand that position at all. Incidentally, I must give to the Home Minister of this Parliament my ungrudging thanks for the very brilliant speech that he made and assured the country that he is not going to deal with these people with Kid gloves Civil liberties for uncivil people, civil liberties for those who do not recognise the law, civil liberties for people who murder in cold blood! There was that lucid and unvarnished statement made by my hon. friend. Swami Ramananda Tirtha that with the use of weapons as many as 250 people were murdered in Telangana and even then you are the champions of civil liberties! The people who have not the least consideration for murdering the liberties of millions of people in this land come here and say they are champions of civil liberties. My friend, Shri Gopalan waxed eloquent on poverty, starvation, misery and hardship. Let me tell him, it is a bad workman that quarrels with his tools. Let him not quarrel with his tools—these are his tools on which he lives. Where would be the Communist Party if there was no poverty, no starvation, no misery and no hardship? These are your means of subsistence. You cannot even come to this House for a moment unless the people are starved, stricken and afflicted.

The hon. Member comes here and says, what have you done within five years? Miracles were expected—he expected that the whole Government would go underground and possibly many miracles would really have come out of it. Governments unfortunately do not go underground. If you reckon the things they have done you will have to say—something different the rest of the world is paying a tribute to this country that this infant Republic has stood and stood well the most crucial trial that it had to pass through. People outside do not judge you by the small internal troubles that you face and overcome but by your capacity to face the national dangers. At a crucial time of history when one nation was not equipped with many things that were required, when it was almost impossible to maintain law and order, we did succeed in maintaining law and order. We did succeed in liquidating 500 odd Indian States in this country, we did succeed in rehabilitating, at least giving them food and shelter, seven million people. Are these small achievements. You see red everywhere. Everything is yellow to the jaundiced eye. Please get your liver examined. You come and say the foreign policy of the Prime Minister is wrong because it has an emphasis on or inclination towards the democratic bloc. I am glad that you are, incidentally, paying a tribute to the Prime Minister. I have come across representatives of many nations who have been thinking that our policy has a larger emphasis towards the Soviet Bloc. They think that perhaps we are midway between the two blocs but you say, "No, the emphasis is on the democratic side". Because these community projects are there and because for technical aid some Americans are coming here, you find Americans spies everywhere. It is simply surprising. Communists are brave people who should not be afraid of anybody, and they should not believe in these fantastic things. My friend Mr. Gopalan says that in every village there is a spy, an American and my friend is afraid of all these spies! You people are not afraid of going underground, why are you afraid of these 'spies'?

Have we not shown during the last five years that despite the immediate advantages that this country might have got we have steered clear of both the democratic and the Soviet blocs? It is not a negative policy but a positive one that requires more action. Has he forgotten—out of gratefulness at least a mention should have been made by some of the speakers on the other side—that India was the only country that championed the cause of Red China for admission into the United Nations? We have been misunderstood, several imme-

[Shri S. K. Patil]

diate advantages have been denied to us but we have persisted in our attempt. Have they forgotten that? Have we not done many things? We may be a member of the Commonwealth but on South Africa, on Ceylon and on Tunisia we stand firm and declare our policy no matter what the advantages and disadvantages are going to be. To call such a policy a partial policy inclined towards the democratic or the Anglo-American bloc is a travesty of truth. Here you have come, you want propaganda, you have incidentally obtained propaganda. You get up and say, "We are the representatives of the people, and who are these people sitting here?" You say you have achieved something phenomenal in Andhra and Hyderabad because you have defeated your opponents there. Your leader was contesting the election in my City of Bombay. He was also a great leader. Had he been elected he would have been there and not Mr. Gopalan as the leader. I do not want to go into the politics of the Communist Party. People came forward and gave their votes to the Congress in a thumping majority because they knew they alone, that is the Congress alone can deliver the goods and not the Communist Party. Therefore, please let us not go on with this habit of finding fault with everything that the Government does or wants to do. Their path is not smooth. it is strewn with hurdles almost insurmountable. not natural but created by you people—strikes everywhere, no work, less work and laziness everywhere. How do you expect the country to prosper? Reference was made to my hon. friend Mr. Nanda's statement that the realisation of the Plan would take three to four years. Well. they seem to have a magic wand: if one of them was the Minister in charge of the portfolio he would produce the goods the very next day because they would come from underground! And therefore everyone has to work in that fashion.

Sir. I do not want to take the time of the House. but one more thing and I have done and that is about the withdrawal of the subsidies. My hon. friend the Finance Minister gave very cogent reasons and he was absolutely right. I do not find fault with his figures. In substance his argument was that instead of spending Rs. 50 crores on food subsidies. if this money is given for the other projects such as minor irrigation etc. by which more food could be produced it would be better. I agree with him. I do not join issue there. But I would ask him in all humility—and this is not merely to find fault—one question. The fact of the matter is that today these poor people are almost driven to desperation and these people sitting opposite here are having excellent food for their propaganda as a result of this. They live on it. People have not got the food, but the parties in opposition have enough food for propaganda. In my opinion if instead of withdrawing the subsidy all at once and thereby causing extreme hardships to people it would have been better if the withdrawal was spread over a period of three or four years there can be a scheme in which the Government of India, the State Governments and the consumer are equal partners; in other words, if the withdrawal is periodical, spread over three or four years, if the State Governments go on adding something to it, and on their side the consumers are asked to bear their burden, surely then the proposition would be quite different. I merely make this as a constructive suggestion, because in the concluding portion of his speech, my hon. friend the Finance Minister said that he is yet to be assured of the quantitative measure of the hardship and then he will think at the time of the Budget what to do. That is a very welcome suggestion indeed and by the time he makes a speech tomorrow, or by the time he takes a decision. I hope he will have before him the figures of the quantitative measure of the hardship that these people are undergoing. and then devise a plan by which instead of all at once withdrawing the subsidy it may be spread over a period of years. It is true that those figures are realistic. but in spite of the accuracy of those figures. the fact remains that there are hungry stomachs and they cannot buy grain. They do not merely do it as a political agitation. Indeed, it is their stomach that really speaks and not their mouth. Any Communist or Socialist or Congressman will accept that position. If we devise a scheme by which we spread the burden of the withdrawal of the subsidy over a certain period and make the State Governments also contribute equally to it, some portion of the burden being borne by the consumers. then possibly the remedy would be better. I am making this as a constructive suggestion in all humility and not as a criticism of what my hon. friend the Finance Minister has said.

With these words I support the motion of conveying our grateful thanks to the President for his Address.

Col. Zaidi (Hardoi Distt.—Noth-West *cum* Farrukhabad Distt.—East *cum* Shahjahanpur Distt.—South): At this late hour I shall try to be as brief as possible. Many of us were eagerly expectant, because for the first time there was to be a vigorous opposition in this House. I must say that we feel greatly disappointed. We want every Member of this House to be vigorously vigilant, but one hopes that criticism would be constructive. Most of the time we have listened to negative criticism and hardly any constructive suggestion. I feel that the old habits of thinking die very hard. For many years, under the British rule when we had no power and no responsibility, we could only sit back and criticise and agitate. The country has now become free. We are the masters of our own destiny. But unconsciously we find it difficult to shake off the old habits and only know to criticise the Government. One would think that many of us hardly realise that the Government is an Indian Government and that it is our own Government. We criticise the Government as if it was composed of foreign rulers. Many people think that because they have got their own Government, there is nothing for them to do. The Government is expected to do everything. This is a very wrong attitude. Under our own Government there is the greater reason, not the less, for every one of us to play his part.

The only constructive suggestion that was made to fight the famine and starvation and the food trouble in this country came from our friend Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee who said that every Member of this House may forego Rs. 10 per day from his allowance of Rs. 40 and contribute that money to a famine relief fund. I should like to know from our friends and comrades on the opposite benches what they have done in their own way, what attempt they have made on their part, to fight this famine, this food scarcity, of which they paint such terrible pictures. I do not deny the existence of famine or the scarcity of food. These are there. The sympathy of everyone goes out to the poor people who are in distress, but is this the time to make political capital out of people's starvation? Our Prime Minister said that he was going to put the food question on a war footing. If there is a war against famine and starvation, should people vilify each other and weaken the hands of the Government? If the scarcity of food has to be fought on a war basis, then everyone must do his bit. Let people come forward and tell us what steps they have taken or their party has taken to fight the scarcity of food. Do not come and tell us only about the terrible things that are happening in the famine-stricken areas. Tell us also about the steps that you are taking, and in all fairness I would address this appeal not only to the opposition benches but also to the Members of my own party. Let the Members of the Congress Party, the Socialist Party, the Communist party and the other parties vie with each other not in scoring points in debate, but in rendering service to the people who are suffering from famine and scarcity of food. What record has anyone come forward and placed before this House of actual service rendered to the famine-stricken people? So far as I have been able to follow, not a word has been said about steps taken by any party to help the starving people. Perhaps on some other occasion we shall hope to be told what the various parties are doing: and if the record of the Socialists or the Communists is better than the record of the Congress Party, then we shall be put to shame and the Government which is responsible to the Congress Party will also be put to shame and learn to do things in a better way.

In the field of social reconstruction, and in the field of social service, it is the non-official agencies which must work and supplement what is being done by the Government. Today in the country there is only one figure outside the official agencies, who has been trying to bring about a tremendous reform. His name was mentioned by a distinguished Member belonging to the K.M.P. Party and that name is Acharya Vinoba Bhave. It is a matter of pride for us of the Congress that this party has produced an Acharya Vinoba Bhave. Have other parties also produced Acharya Vinoba Bhaves? If so, let them mention their names and their achievements, and we shall then be put to shame and agree that superior work and better work is being done for the country by those parties. But mere empty criticism, devoid of any suggestions, devoid of any examples of definite contributions made for the solution of the problems of this country, leads nowhere. In the industrial field, one may perhaps think that better work can be done in the public sector. But so far as social reconstruction and service of the people is concerned, I feel that it is the private sector which occupies a position of great importance. It will be a sad day for our great country if good and

[Col. Zaidi]

noble things for the service of the people are done by the Government only and not by our countrymen through non-official agencies.

It was stated yesterday that the Prime Minister had made an appeal that we should miss one meal a day. How many people are missing one meal a day and making their contribution to the Famine Relief Fund? Without doing the least little thing, without undergoing any sacrifices, to talk tall and criticise the Government is not the way of serving the country.

We often talk of communalism and provincialism and casteism in this country. There is a reference to it in the President's address also. But I feel that the worst enemy of all, the canker which eats into the very vitals of our people, is selfishness. I think to a very great extent even communalism and provincialism and casteism raise their heads because someone is trying to serve his own interests, speaking in the name of these "isms". Underlying everything is our selfishness. And—I hope I am wrong—with the advent of freedom, instead of more patriotism, instead of less selfishness, I find around me, a little more selfishness and a little less of patriotism. We cannot go on in this way. To expect that the Government will do everything and change the face of this country, and that India will then flow with milk and honey, is a dream which will never be realised. Look at a country like England. Ever since 1940 the people there have been told repeatedly to tighten their belts. Things are being denied to them. They grumble a little, but put up with the privations. There is not too much of grumbling. I do not know if the opposition party there came forward and blamed the Government of the day for asking the people to tighten their belts. We know that the English people eat a great deal of meat and eggs. I am told that in England now people get only two chops of meat and one egg per week. And yet they put up with it; they do not grumble. In our country, whenever we are called upon to make some sacrifice, to tighten our belts, we are full of resentment; we grouse. And yet we are wonderfully patriotic and are prepared to lay down our lives for our country! This is not the way to make India great. Before we expect the Government to do everything for us, let us realise that it is our duty to play our part and not to shout and grumble and agitate when we are called upon to make some sacrifice.

There is only one more thing which I would like to refer to with your permission. I said that it has become difficult for many of us to forget the ways of thinking in which we indulged in the British times. There is another aspect to it, and that is our administration. In the British times, the rulers of India, white or brown, did not feel the necessity of identifying themselves with the people; they were a class apart. There was no need for them to look up to the people for their co-operation because the main thing was the maintenance of law and order. The emphasis was on stability, not on progress. I am sorry that the same mental attitude somehow persists in the ranks of the administration. I would be most unwilling to criticise our officers who cannot defend themselves in this House. Many of them do a fine job of work and, according to their lights, they are serving their country; they are a patriotic set of people. But they still are dominated by the traditions of the British times. They will work for the people, but they cannot be expected to explain themselves to the people. The country does not know the fine work which is being done by the Government. There is not enough publicity. Efforts are not made to enlist the people's willing, enlightened and intelligent co-operation. In China, I am told—I have not been there—that the modern technique of audio-visual instruction has been made use of to the full. They organise exhibitions and lectures where even school boys and girls are told what the Government is trying to do for the country. There is a wave of enthusiasm created. Confidence is created in the people in whatever the Government does. In the simplest possible terms and forms, things are explained to every one. Therefore people respond. They understand. They are educated. And the fact that people have understood and appreciated and are willing to co-operate in its turn gives a new confidence to the officials and to the Government. The two act and react on each other. I feel that we should do much more than has been done to educate our new masters, the people of India. We should tell them what the Government wants to do and then try and enlist their co-operation. I know that the response of the people will not be found wanting.

11 A. M.

In the end, I should like to quote some words that I came across in yesterday's paper:

> "For 20 years at least, and it may be, ever since World War I, Gen. Eisenhower has many times quoted Woodrow Wilson's state-

ment: 'The highest form of efficiency is the spontaneous co-operation of a free people'".

I am sure that if we appeal to the people for their spontaneous co-operation and take the trouble to educate them, their co-operation will not be insignificant and they will not be found wanting.

Pandit Fotedar (Jammu and Kashmir): With your permission, Sir, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks on the Presidential address. I afford myself this opportunity, because a certain amount of misunderstanding has unfortunately been created by certain interested elements regarding the Kashmir issue. After the thoughtful and statesmanlike speech of my senior colleague, Maulana Mohammad Saeed on a controversy so unfortunate, so baseless and so seemingly engineered by interested elements regarding the Kashmir question, I felt that I would have been infinitely better off if I had not spoken at all. But since Maulana's speech was cut short on account of the limitation of time, it became imperative for me to contribute my observations regarding the debate that has been going on here for the last three days with particular reference to the Kashmir issue.

Before I refer myself to the Kashmir issue, I would like to say certain words and contribute certain observations and submit them to the wisdom of this great Parliament, regarding the salient points which have been under the fire of criticism for the last three days. As a student of history and politics and also as one having a certain amount of knowledge regarding the functioning of parliamentary opposition in democracies elsewhere, I concede that opposition directed in purposeful channels towards the larger interests of the country and for the attainment of the good of the people in general and opposition devoid of personal malice or prejudice, is in fact the essence of democracy and no democracy will be worth its name if there is no opposition. It may lapse into dictatorship if there is no opposition in the real sense of the term. But what do we find here? Here in this great Parliament we find that the Opposition—the least to be said about it—has been most undignified and most destructive. It is devoid of constructive suggestions. The opposition in this House has been functioning with the sole object of wrecking the Constitution and thus wrecking the larger interests of the country as a whole for ulterior motives and the wonder of it is that this is all being done in the name of the larger interests of the suffering teeming millions and in the name of patriotism and of human values. I have found one thing about our Opposition in this House and that is that it lacks in parliamentary etiquette, it lacks in parliamentary discipline and it lacks in parliamentary decorum. I can conveniently say and I am sure that the House would agree with me that unfortunately the Opposition here has not made much difference between the Parliament and the platform. I am not here to present to the House or to the Opposition a long catalogue of the achievements of the Congress Government and I think an opportunity will be available to me in the course of the discussion on the Budget when I may do so. But here I may say that it is alleged by the Opposition that the Congress Government has not been able to achieve anything. I am sure, and there can be no two opinions about the fact that it is the Congress Government's greatest achievement that it has saved humanity, it has saved secularity and it has saved democracy in Kashmir from falling in to the lap of the Titanic hordes of medieaval Barbarism and yet I am surprised to find that there has not been even a single word of thanks from the Opposition about all this.

In the field of foreign politics and foreign policy I have not got to say much. But I trust the House will concede that our late revered leader Sardar Patel integrated India nationally and it is Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who built up India internationally. And today we find that India, within a short span of five years, has emerged on the world stage as a power to be honoured, as a nation to be respected and as a nation which has after all found its legitimate place in the comity of the nations of the world. I say, Sir, that it is most surprising as it is equally harmful that the Opposition should have the check to dub our leader, who has built up the foundations of the nation, who shook the foundations of British Imperialism in India and who has been the greatest progressive revolutionary and an uncompromising foe of Imperialism, colonialism and expansionism, a reactionary and who wants to barter away India to America. I am asking who was he, the man of power, who first recognised the Peking Government? Who was he who sounded a note of warning to the United Nations for not proceeding beyond the 38th Parallel? Who, in the name of democracy, in the name of the people's Government and people's aspirations, convened an Asiatic Conference on Indonesia? Who is he who is taking up the Tunisian question? It is our great leader here

[Pandit Fotedar]

in India who has helped nations to attain the right of self-determination in order to rise up and to build themselves up according to their own needs and plans and not to be subservient to any foreign country or foreign power. The Congress organisation as a party in power may even excel the Communist philosophy in serving the needs of the people. I want the Opposition here to note once and for all that whatever be the economic set up of the society that we will have, it will have the brand and stamp of India; it cannot have the stamp of Russia or any other foreign country.

However, Sir, since I wanted to speak something regarding Kashmir, I will come to it now. It is unfortunate that certain so-called stalwarts of the Hindudom should have thought it patriotic and desirable after full five years of Kashmir controversy to make this august Parliament as an arena for carrying out their misconceived propaganda about Kashmir. I have no doubt that Kashmir can strengthen all the existing bonds of friendship and amity with India in an atmosphere of goodwill, in an atmosphere of friendliness, but not in an atmosphere of hostility and mischievous and misconceived propaganda about the great leader of Kashmir, Sheikh Abdullah or Kashmiris being dubbed as communalist and political turn coats. It is not for the first time that they have flared up. Their number may be very very negligible, but they have been continuously doing it for the last five years. I would like to refer to Mr. Jinnah. Mr. Jinnah wanted only two things. He wanted liquidation of Abdulaism in Kashmir and isolation of Kashmir from India. What Jinnah failed to achieve in his life time, these so-called stalwarts of our Hindudom today are trying to fulfil. They have come to fill up that gap and thereby they are paying now Jinnah the homage of a hearty flattery. But I may assure them, and let this august Parliament note it once and for all that our stand about Kashmir is "Kashmiris are one and that Kashmir is indivisible, Kashmir is Bharat and Bharat is Kashmir." (*Hear hear*).

There is no other way. This is the path that was shown to Kashmiris by Gandhiji, this is the path which was adopted by Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah, the accredited leader of 40 lakhs of Kashmiris. This was owned by us and no amount of provocation, no amount of mischievous propaganda, no amount of intimidation and no amount of temptation can deflect Kashmiris from the path of righteousness, from the path of humanity, from the path of making this great experiment, in this great drama of opening up of a new chapter in the history of humanity. I say,—and it is not just a boast—that Kashmiris will lay down their lives in following the path shown by the Father of the Nation, rather than surrender that path.

One thing I would like to say. This accession of Kashmir with India has not been and is not just the accession of Sheikh Abdullah with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, howsoever big they may be. It is the accession of 40 lakhs of Kashmiris with 40 crores of Indians. It is the accession of ideology, the union of hearts. This cannot be assessed—I speak and refer to Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee—in terms of money. It is a case of ideology and it is a union of ideologies, it is the base of humanity for which we live and we will die. But one thing is certain that Kashmir is a place of destiny and Kashmir along with India will plant the banner of Ghandiji not only on the Forts of India, but on the Forts of the whole world.

On a certain statement—excuse me, Sir, two minutes more—tendentiously reported, wrongly reported, by the Press Sheikh Abdullah's patriotism, his struggle and sacrifice for the past 20 years and so late in the day had come in for criticism and he was being dubbed as a turn coat and what not? I would have liked Mr. Chatterji and Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee—who was a Minister then—should have come to Kashmir in the year 1947 when there was a conflagration, when there was a gigantic communal flare up in the country and in the two Punjabs men indulged in activities, which would degrade even the brute. Our borders had flared up and Muslims and Hindus were fleeing for their lives. Pakistan inspired aggression had reached our doors and Qabalis were battering at our gates, when the Maharaja had left and the administrative machinery had broken down from within. What came between Kashmir and Pakistan? Was it not the principle of nationhood, the principle of brotherhood, of humanity, of communal harmony with which the Kashmiris are fully saturated under the guidance of Sheikh Abdullah, their beloved leader that saved Kashmir? We the people without armour, without weapons took up stones, marched against the invader and saved the country, and today we are with secular India. We went to India not for the sake of money. We went to India because India was secular, India was progressive and India appreciated our struggle for freedom. We wanted to preserve the fruits of our hard-won freedom and at the same time secular harmony. Therefore, we went to India and we are with India and we must be with India.

About communal organisations they say that there are some communal organisations like the Praja Parishad. I know of no people's organisation except the National Conference. There may be some interested coterie of friends. The National Conference fought and won the elections, and if somebody had boycotted them it is as they say, it is the weaker who is thrown to the wells, but they went to the well themselves.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has taken 16 minutes.

Pandit Fotedar: It has been said that there is reign of terror, in Jammu. It is such a fantastic innovation that it does not deserve the dignity of a formal denial ordinary. Mr. Chatterjee I am told, has been a very great Judge of the High Court. He says somebody informed him—but he has not been able to tell the name of that person—that there is terrorism. He has not been able to tell us how many people were arrested, how many were hanged, what was the extent of prosecutions and persecutions and lathi charges to justify the charge of terrorism. This great information is known only to Mr. Chatterjee and Mr. Deshpande and to nobody else. In Kashmir we are confronted with an enemy who is unscrupulous, to whom nothing is sacred: Kashmir is passing through the most crucial period of her history since last five years and both the national and the International situation around us, frought with consequences as it is imposes alround caution and anything done even inadvertently may prove prejudicial to the larger interest of both India and Kashmir and for the sacred principles we stand for.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): At long last I got an opportunity of taking part in this debate and I do so on behalf of the Democratic Independent Party sitting on these benches. By habit and training I do not use any expressions of incitement and as such I request hon. Members wherever they might be sitting not to be excited under any circumstances. We have been expecting both inside the House and outside an expression from the President's address of a comprehensive policy of the Government in regard to the internal policy and the external policy. But we are disappointed in not having such a comprehensive policy enunciated in the President's speech which is now under debate. In paragraph 7, we find that "we have consistently pursued a policy of friendship with all countries of the world and that policy, though sometimes misunderstood, has been very greatly appreciated by others and is yielding fruit." I have searched for the fruits that have been yielded by such a policy, but being a new Member of the House I have not been able to contact the relevant reports to have a clear idea on the subject. But anyhow from the report that has been placed in my hands a couple of days back, Report of the Ministry of External Affairs for 1951-52, I find that the policy of friendship has not been reciprocated by the other countries or nations. Reading out a few extracts I will tell the House that the policy pursued has not been reciprocated in the way in which it was expected. We have in 1951-52 spent an amount of nearly 6½ crores and the results of it have not been of much benefit to us. The most difficult problems that are now facing this country are the problems that have been created in South Africa and Ceylon. We, coming from South India know how excited and strong the expression of opinion in South India is in favour of the Indian Nationals in South Africa and Ceylon. To what extent this Government has been able to tackle those questions can be found out from the following extracts of the said report.

> "The position of persons of Indian origin in South Africa has further deteriorated with the promulgation last year of various notifications and regulations for the implementation of the Group Areas Act."

It is further said that "the correspondence initiated by the Government of India for implementing the United Nations General Assembly Resolution of December 1950 proved infructuous, and that the Secretary to the High Commissioner for India in the Union of South Africa, who was holding the charge of the office in the absence of the High Commissioner, has left South Africa on transfer . . . "The Mission is now in charge of the Assistant Secretary."

That shows the amount of responsibility and the interest that have been taken by the Central Government in regard to South African affairs. I know that the South African problem is a chronic one. Even the sacrifices of Mahatma Gandhi have not been able to secure success against the South Africans.

Coming to Ceylon, it is said in the Report of the External Affairs Ministry

[Shri Ramachandra Reddi]

for the year 1951-52, that "the Government of Ceylon continued to follow a Ceylonisation policy in trade and employment throughout the year. Whenever any hardship was caused to Indian interests, redress was sought from the Government of Ceylon by the High Commissioner for India in Ceylon." From this, it will be seen that nothing has been done so far. May I ask whether any arrangements have been made by the Central Government to take up this question at a higher level, and find out to what extent there is a possibility of coming to a compromise? I would suggest that the hon. the Prime Minister himself or any other Cabinet Minister might be deputed to these two countries to find out to what extent there is a possibility of a compromise on these two matters of urgent importance.

Coming to Kashmir, it must be said that it has become the red rag of the politicians in India. Everybody feels either in favour of it or against it; everybody feels that something has been done which has not been quite in the interests of India. With regard to Kashmir, it is said that "the United Nations Security Council continued their efforts to settle the Kashmir dispute. A new representative Dr. Frank P. Graham was appointed as mediator. An interim report on his efforts was submitted to the Security Council in October and a final report on December 18, 1951. The latter was discussed by the Council in January 1952." Beyond this expression of opinion, nothing else has been forthcoming. I would like therefore to ask the government what are the specific attempts that have been made by this government to solve these problems at an early date.

In this connection, I would invite the attention of the hon. Prime Minister and the present Cabinet to the urgent necessity of following certain valuable principles of conduct in regard to the foreign policy of the Central Government. So far, they have evidently been depending on themselves, either on an individual decision or on a decision by the entire Cabinet or Cabinet Committee. I would like to suggest that it is absolutely necessary in the interests of India and the Indian nationals abroad, that one should follow the fixed policy of consulting the Opposition to the extent that it is desirable. In this connection, I would like to read out to you an analogy from the British practice, from 'Cabinet Government' by Mr. Ivor Jennings. Dealing with the position of the opposition he says that:

"Sometimes, indeed, it agrees not to oppose. This is particularly true of foreign affairs. For the enmity within is as nothing compared with the enmity without. The suggestion that nation is divided gives encouragement to enemies abroad. From the outbreak of war in 1914 until the formation of the Coalition Government in 1915, the Opposition did not oppose in public but made representations in private. The Government in its turn communicated paraphrases of secret cable—paraphrases in case the documents should not fall into enemy hands and so disclose the cyphers—to the Opposition 'Shadow Cabinet'. Mr. Austen Chamberlain, as the former Conservative Chancellor of the Exchequer, assisted the Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer on the financial questions of the war. Agreement was especially necessary where secret promises were made which might have to be carried out by a subsequent government, as with the promise to allot Constantinople to Russia". He further points out:

> "Nor is this process necessarily limited to foreign affairs. It appears that the Labour Government of 1931 consulted the Opposition on the financial crisis of that year."

I have drawn the attention of the Government to that analogy so that they might have recourse to similar consultations with the Members of the Opposition or with the Members that do not belong to their own party. In the administration of our country, there should be no mutual misunderstanding and mutual suspicion, and to the extent that confidence can be placed in the Opposition Members, the policy of consulting them in private might be adopted. As a matter of fact, it is not possible and desirable to have open consultations and discussions on the floor of this House, with regard to foreign policy. I would suggest therefore that the analogy of Britain in the administration of the foreign policy might be considered. I might also mention that there is a similar policy adopted in the United States of America, namely the 'Bi-partisan policy'. I offer this suggestion to the hon. Prime Minister and his Cabinet, for careful consideration.

Some Hon. Members: The hon. Member may continue.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Members cannot give time. It must be left to the Chair. The hon. Member wanted only ten minutes. He has been given twelve minutes.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi. I do not want to take any more time Sir.

Shri C. D. Pande: (Naini Tal Distt. *cum* Almora Distt.—South West *cum* Bareilly Distt.—North): I wish I could have been called a little earlier; unfortunately my name was not called.

I had intended to confine myself mainly to foreign policy, which had been attacked by the Members from the opposite side. In the course of this debate this morning, they had given some new information which is absolutely far from being correct; I want to correct some of the misimpressions that have been created in this House. Some hon. Members have said that the Communists were fighting a battle against feudalism in Hyderabad. That is an absolutely false and incorrect statement. They were in fact fighting along the ranks of Kasim Razvi. Hon. Members from Hyderabad State have assured me that the Communists were fighting along with Kasim Razvi; and the Laik Ali Government supplied arms to them, which are still in their possession. They are trying to make themselves the heroes of the South by calling themselves as the heroic defenders of the peasantry. That is an erroneous impression which ought to be cleared up.

Now, I come to the main subject, namely the foreign policy of our Government. We must remember that our foreign policy is based on two central concepts, democratic freedom and peace. These are the two basic ideals for which India stands. Now let us examine whether we have deviated from these two ideals in our foreign policy. In the circumstances in which India is placed in the world to-day, there could not have been any other policy which could have been followed by the present Congress Government.

Then they say what achievements we have made so far and how many friends we have made. I say a policy like this, a policy practised by a nation with our equipment, with our lack of military strength, could not have done anything better than we have done. Even then, our record of achievement is tremendous. Only one has to look for the last five years history. First of all, I will relate to you the part played by our Prime Minister in the freedom movement of Indonesia. You must be remembering in your mind that Indonesia owes us a great deal. Her freedom was won by our intervention, by the intervention of our Prime Minister. And those people are even today beholden to us. Perhaps our critics do not remember and do not want to give this credit to us. Then, let me tell you about our next-door neighbour Nepal. We have freed 8 million of our people from the bondage of the Rana serfdom.

Then they forget of what we have done in the Middle East. You must be knowing that Pakistan, our neighbour was forging a Pan-Islamic movement and if that scheme, if that pernicious scheme had borne fruit, we would have been in great difficulty. But our diplomacy in the Middle East has cut at the root of this Pan-Islamic movement and the Arab League has refused to align itself with it. It should be a matter of pride to us that the countries of the Middle East are looking to us for guidance and friendship rather than to Pakistan. It is no mean achievement that Egypt is looking to us; that Afghanistan is our friend, and not a friend of Pakistan. And we are doing what we can to unify the countries, the downtrodden countries of Asia and we have succeeded to a great extent in achieving that object. If we were not in the field, most of the countries would have lost their freedom, and most of them would not have won their freedom. Then it could be said that we could have done better if we had joined either of the blocs, but you must realise in your mind whether we could have been consistent with our basic policy of peace and democratic freedom. Do they advise us to join the Russian bloc? Do they think we could have been free if we had joined the Russian bloc? Do they thing we should go the way of Czechoslovakia has gone, the way Rumania has gone, the way China is going now? We do not want to play that role in the world. We would rather go under than be within the iron curtain of Russia. We must be clear on this point whether we want democratic freedom or not.

One gentleman, Mr. H. N. Mukherji said he was a patriot. I was surprised to hear that. No Communist can be a patriot. Patriotism and Communism do not go together. Your patriotism is towards your fatherland, Russia. You look to Russia. If India is defeated, if India is down-trodden, you will not mind. If anything happens to Russia, you will be very sorry, because we have seen during the last war you changed colours thrice.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member will address the Chair. He will at least speak in the third person.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): With your permission, Sir, I would like Members not to address each other in this way. I think it is most objectionable.

Shri C. D. Pande: But, as most of the Members were admonished for that and they still persisted, I am also a victim of that habit. Anyhow, I am telling you that, ours being a true democracy, we cannot go with Russia. That is a fundamental fact and we can never give it up whatever may happen.

Then, the second thing as to why we do not join the American bloc. We do not want to join the American bloc because they are not for the freedom of the colonial people, they the against and a hindrance to their freedom. They are treating their coloured people shamefully in their own country. Their domination and exploitation enjoins us not to be with them. Therefore, we are sailing a clear path of neutrality. I call it a positive policy of peace and freedom. A country like India having a glorious past and present status must follow an independent path. If we join Russia, then our people will have to suffer what the great statesmen of Czechoslovakia, Polland and Hungry have suffered. You know how many people there have committed suicide, how many people wanted to run away from the country. They were just liquidated. Were they not patriots? Did they not fight the battle of freedom in their own country? They had to leave their own country because the atrocities of the dictatorship were so great. Now, I will say a few words about . . .

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member will avoid personal references. and speak in the third person. If he will only look towards me and not to the other side, it will be all right.

Shri C. D. Pande: The Members on the opposite side have shown great impatience in not achieving the Five Year Plan in the time stipulated and they are not very hopeful that things will be achieved within the coming five years as well. I will tell them that in Russia they too had Five Year Plans. In fact, we have learnt these plans from Russia. But we must know the price the Russians have paid for making their plans successful. Are they ready to make those sacrifices. They grumble at small inconveniences here and there. When we find there is some difficulty, they invoke democracy, freedom of the individual and civil liberties. But in Russia the civil liberties of millions of people have been crushed, and then they achieved a certain amount of success. Our friends here are not going to pay the price.

पंडित ए० आर० शास्त्री : अध्यक्ष महोदय में एक प्रार्थना प्रधान मंत्री जी से करना चाहता हूं। में यह अनुरोध करता हूं कि वह अपना भाषण राष्ट्र भाषा हिन्दी में दें।

[**Pandit A. R. Shastri** (Azamgarh Distt.—East *cum* Ballia Distt.—West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a request to the Prime Minister. I would appeal to him to deliver his speech in Hindi, our National Language.]

Mr. Chairman: It is open to the hon. Prime Minister and every Member of the House to speak in any language he likes Both the languages can be spoken on the floor of the House.

पंडित ए० आर० शास्त्री : मैं अपनी प्रार्थना आधे मिन्ट में कर लेता। मुझे सिर्फ यह कह लेने दीजिये।

[**Pandit A. R. Shastri:** I would take only half a minute to put forth my request. I may be allowed to say just that much.]

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I have listened with care and, I hope, earnestness to this debate which has lasted nearly four days, sometimes with a measure of astonishment also at the things that have been said. I am perhaps at a certain disadvantage compared to hon. Members on the other side of the House, and more specially those on the opposing benches, because I have to try, at any rate, to speak with a certain restraint, because I cannot refer to great countries or small casually, either condemning them or praising them up to the skies. It may be that I do not agree with what another country says or does, but hon. Members will appreciate that the foreign policy of Governments is not carried on in the same way as public meetings are carried on, that the phraseology which may come very easily to some hon. Members on the other side of the House is not used when responsible people speak about other countries.

First of all, I should like to point out, as has been pointed out in fact before, the strange misconception about the President's address. Hon.

Members have given notice of hundreds of amendments and in their speeches have pointed out how many things are not included in the address. Now, the address is not meant to be a catalogue of all the things that have to be done. It is a brief, a concise statement, with some reference to foreign policy, of what the next session of Parliament is likely to do. That is all. This particular session specially is a budget session and, as is pointed out in the President's address, not much legislation can be undertaken. In any event it is, I think, not possible or desirable for the President's address to contain these long lists of all that we wish to do. Therefore, for us to be told that it does not contain references to so many subjects shows a certain misapprehension of the situation.

There are many things. For instance an hon. Member from Manipur, I think, talked about the tribal people, about the Nagas in particular. Well, so far as I am concerned I attach the very greatest importance to the tribal people of India, and I hope that this House also will consider this matter at the proper time more fully, not only because there are a large number of tribal folk in the country but because they occupy a very special position and have a very special culture which, I think, should be protected and helped to advance on the lines of its own genius. I do not want the tribal culture to be overwhelmed or exploited by others among our people, because they happen to be simple folk.

So in this way there are many other matters. Reference was made to the refugees, that nothing is said about them. On a previous occasion there were full particulars given in the President's address of the rehabilitation of refugees. Now, I do not see the point of repeated reference unless you merely wish the President to go on saying that we wish well by them and we would like this to be done.

So I should like the House now and, I hope, in the future to deal with the President's address in a concise way. I do not wish to limit the freedom of the House to discuss any matter. But the result is that somehow we get lost in a maze of detail and the main points that should come out in such a debate are somewhat hidden from view. No doubt we have had a fairly long debate and many points have arisen, and I shall in the course of what I say refer to some of the minor matters if I have time and to some of the major matters.

First of all, I should like to say a few words about something that fell from Dr. Mookerjee and perhaps one or two other Members opposite. They asked for some measure of co-operation from Government with the opposition, in regard to various policies that we adopt or are likely to pursue. I want to say that so far as we on the Government side are concerned, we would welcome every kind of co-operation from every Member of this House, whether he sits on this side of the House or the other. It may be that in certain vital matters, there may be differences of opinion, basic differences, but I feel quite sure that there is a large field over which there can be co-operation, and even in matters where there might be difference of opinion, it is always a good thing to see and hear the other opinion and then form your own. Naturally the Government cannot give up its responsibility for coming to its own decisions, but in doing so, it certainly wishes to consult and to have the views of other Members of the House, whoever they might be.

Having said that, I would like to point out that it is not a particularly easy matter to pursue that course always. Stress has been laid by some hon. Members on the fact that the majority party in this House according to some arithmetical and mathematical calculation represents 47 decimal something percentage of the electorate. I take that figure to be correct. I have no personal means of judging it, but then, of course the question arises as to what mathematical percentage hon. Members on the other side represent (*Hear, hear*). It will interest the House to know that the Members of the Communist Party plus the Peoples Democratic Front of Hyderabad etc. represent 4·45 per cent. The Socialist Party represents the most and from this point of view, it represents 10:5 per cent. The K.M.P. Party represents 5·8 per cent., the Jan Sangh 3 per cent. The Scheduled Castes Federation 2·3 per cent., the Independents 15 per cent. and so on till we get into infinitesimal fractions. Now we have in these Members who sit in the opposition every variety of opinion—I say so with all respect and if it is represented in colours from scarlet, various hues of red, pink and yellow to deep blue. If you represented in the normal language of the West, you have every variety in the Opposition from the extreme left to the extreme right. They hold together, I suppose because of the stress of circumstances and sometimes there are marriages of convenience, sometimes followed by rapid divorces, and on the whole we find these strange bedfellows consorting together because

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

of a certain spirit of opposition to the majority group. I do not criticise that. I am merely pointing out the fact that where you have this motley array, it is not exceedingly easy to deal with it in the matter of consultation, etc. But I do wish to make it clear that we are desirous of having that consultation and co-operation wherever it is possible.

We welcome the coming to this House of the Members of the Opposition. Whoever they may be, and however much we might differ from them in many matters, we welcome them, because, undoubtedly, they represent a certain section of Indian opinion, and because it is good in a House of this kind to have a vigorous opposition so that whether it is Government or the majority party, they do not become complacent. If I may strike a personal note, regardless of the present differences, when I see many faces of old comrades who belong to the opposition now, some memories of the past come to me. I do not wish to forget them, and I cannot imagine that ways may not be found for a measure of co-operation with those with whom we have co-operated in the past. It is in this spirit that I approach this problem.

It would be easy for me, or perhaps not so difficult, to address my friends in a spirit of argument, of bandying words and making debating points as other hon. Members have rightly done. But, I do feel the importance of this occasion because the matters that we are considering are of grave import.

An hon. Member told me that I had lost my place in history because of the attraction of some tinsel, something or other. Well, it is a matter of little consequence, what happens to me in history. It is a matter of little consequence ultimately what happens to any individual present here in history. But, it is a matter of very large consequence what happens to India and her millions of people. Therefore, forgetting the personal aspect, I should like to direct your attention to certain basic facts of the situation.

Perhaps, when we consider certain important issues like the economic issues confronting our country, there might be differences; there might be a very large measure of agreement as to ideals and objectives; the differences may be about the methods to achieve them: maybe the speed, maybe the cost, and many other things. But, there is a certain vital method of approach to these problems, which has obsessed my mind, if I may say so.

12 Noon.

Just think of the state of affairs in India four and a half years ago when Independence came, because, you have to judge of every situation in a particular context. You may have principles; you may have ideals; but, you cannot divorce ideals or principles from the particular context in which you are working. The Communist Party in India has changed its policy many times in the last few years. It is open to it to do so. It is not for me to lay down their policy. But, I am merely pointing out how they have changed their policy repeatedly, because they found themselves off the track, because they found themselves losing what they thought was so important, that is, the confidence of the Indian people which they aimed at getting. So, compelled by circumstances they had to give up something about which they were shouting so loudly a few months before. Ultimately, you have to adapt yourself. You have to have certain ideals and certain objectives. You have to give certain priorities to them. But, you cannot carry on an ideal regardless of the context, regardless of the consequences, because, if you do so, the ideals may go and may take with them many other things that you thought were quite safe.

Many of the hon. Members present here know recent history in Europe and elsewhere, and know how at the end of certain conflict between progressive forces in great countries, there came out not the victory of those forces, but a victory of the most naked fascism. That thing occurs. People talk about revolution, believe in it, maybe, and work it out, maybe. But, because they do not judge the circumstances properly, because they act wrongly, they actually open the door to counter revolution. It is not good enough that you try for great objectives; it is equally important, if not more so, that you try to achieve them through right methods. That is, of course, I should be told, a platitude, as we have been told that the President's address contains platitudes. All the great truths of the world are platitudes. But it is no answer to meet an ancient platitude which is true by well-worn cliches which sometimes hon. Members of the opposition indulge in.

So we have seen that in spite of progressive movements trying to attain certain ideals they have lost ground and something completely reactionary has come into the field as in some countries of Europe. Now with this background look at India four and a half years ago, four years nine months, whatever the period is—August, 1947. How many Members remember that period vividly? It is a matter of history now, and public memory is short. That was a period when independence suddenly came to us and came peacefully so far as the British were concerned. and that was an advantage because it is easier to build after a peaceful transfer than otherwise. But it was followed by enormous upheavals, migrations, violence, massacres, etc. in Pakistan, on our side of the border and on their side. We had suddenly to face apart from these upheavals a new country where everything was split up—army, police, services, telephones, telegraphs, wireless, railway system, transport, everything was split up suddenly overnight and on top of that came these upheavals and mass violence on a prodigious scale. And then these migrations of unhappy people, losing everything, coming in their millions. I do not know of a single instance in history where a country had to face exactly this kind of a thing. Well, we had to face it and we had to face something much more. All kinds of reactionary forces not liking the changeover from the British power to the new nationalist Government wanted to upset that Government. It had nothing to do with the fact—if I may say so, forget it for the moment—that it was dominated by the Congress Party. It is immaterial, it was a national, a more or less progressive Government. All kinds of reactionary forces did not like that—feudal forces, communal forces, other forces—because they thought, rightly or wrongly that this new Government is going to work for social and economic change— they did not want that. So behind the power of that communal upheaval in India there arose all kinds of counter-revolutionary violent movements all over northern India. Our friends who come from the South may have no conception of this because they were far away from the scene of action but here in northern India we lived in the middle of this upheaval where all the reactionary forces were fighting for mastery. They could not have succeeded, of course, in the sense of really gaining mastery as a whole because they did not have that strength. But they did have strength in that particular context to break up things, a destructive strength, and it was touch and go whether that would succeed because if that had succeeded it would undoubtedly have spread all over India. Of course we would have got over it because I think India and the people of India are fundamentally sound, but we would have had a considerable period of anarchic violence, not even violence for any supposed noble cause but just anarchic violence where every man with a band of hundred men behind him is the master of a particular patch of land. We would have gone on to that period of history which brought in the British power to India, when India was disrupted, states fighting each other, not thinking of the whole country.

And so we had to face this situation. We had to face it not for a day or week but for a lengthy period. Gradually, we overcame it at tremendous cost not only in the shape of human suffering, in the shape of migrations etc. but at tremendous cost in other ways and that took many, many months. But in a sense it took years—I mean in the sense of controlling this grave situation, arranging for the rehabilitation of the refugees and the rest. What was the basic duty of any Government that India might have possessed then? The phrase "Law and order" is often used. May I say with all respect to my colleague the Home Minister that I dislike that phrase. I do not dislike the meaning behind it, but I dislike that phrase. I dislike it because others have used it on other occasions and at other times wrongly. Do not call it law and order. If you like, say that it is an essential thing that at a time like this the unity and stability of the country should be maintained. Therefore if I may speak in terms of history, the first priority was for the unity and stability of India to be maintained. It just did not matter what economic or social ideals you might have had, because they could not flourish and you could make no advance along those lines unless there was this cohesion of India, unless India held together, and there was a measure of peace and a measure of stability about her. Therefore, from this consideration of priorities, it became quite essential to lay the greatest stress on that.

Now, what did many of our friends do at that time? I have not mentioned the other difficulties that we had. I did not mention that Kashmir came into the picture and later Hyderabad. I am also not referring for the moment to the Telengana movement. But we had the old, feudal Hyderabad and behind this picture always there were conflicts with Pakistan and I should be quite frank with you and say that no man knew at what moment there might not be war with Pakistan in those years. So, we lived on the verge of this conflict. We did not know

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

whether the Kashmir struggle might extend to a large war; whether Pakistan or Hyderabad might lead to it, or something else. We were not going to war with Pakistan, but we did not know what the people of Pakistan, or the Government of Pakistan might or might not do. We had to be prepared for all contingencies—naturally. So, here is the background. Now, what cooperation did we get in this moment of great national peril,—not Congress peril, not a party matter, but a national peril,—what help did we get from many of the groups and parties represented on the other side? There were the communal parties; each aided and abetted these disruptive tendencies. There were our friends of the Communist Party who tried to take advantage of that national difficulty, by giving trouble in small ways and big, all over the country, and ultimately in a few months' time while this peril lasted and was at its highest, by the development of this Telengana business. Think of the background. I cannot conceive how hon. Members opposite who are so intelligent and so eloquent could have been ignorant of this background. They did something which might have shattered India and made it go to pieces. It just does not matter how noble their sympathies were for any cause and how that cause was influenced, because that cause itself was bound to suffer and fail if they did not take this larger view of things in India. Therefore, it is not a question of my arguing with hon. Members about certain noble ideals that they might have had.

Hon. Members talk about the current of history and historic forces. I agree. Let us judge things by the current of history and historic forces. Let us see where the current is leading us, and what is the first thing and what is the first priority; because if that current itself somehow falls over a precipice and is dashed into a thousand little streamlets, then it ceases to be a current and I say that at that moment the first and the most essential objective that an India should have had was to hold together India, was to keep the unity of India and then, at the same time, if you like go ahead as far as you can maintain the other most important thing, the social and economic progress of India.

Hon. Members often draw parallels with other countries. Here again I am at a disadvantage, because I do not wish to make invidious comparisons and I do not wish to say ill of any country. I am not afraid of any parallel that you might draw with any country. I do not mean to say that we as a Government have not made mistakes; that we could not have done many things which we could have done or that we should have avoided doing something which we ought not to have done. I admit that failing. But I do submit to this House that this Government—and if I may say so, this party, the Congress—has performed a certain historic function which was essential and that historic function was to hold India together, to lay down certain basic foundations on which you can build the future social and economic fabric of India, because without those foundations all your attempts would have failed. We did that. And if I may again carry on that metaphor, even to this day the Congress represents a certain historic need in this country in that respect; it has gained and continues to gain a large measure of sympathy from our public. The moment it ceases to perform that historic task and does not change itself to perform the new historic task, that moment the Congress or any party will cease to function effectively. Let us admit that. It is not a matter of individuals, however bright or clever they may be, or of election organisation and the like, but of putting yourself parallel, and in tune, with the current of human events and history. If you do that, well you are doing something important. If, on the other hand, you get divorced from it, then you stagnate and cease to be—whether it is the Congress or the Communist Party or any other. That matter is not going to be judged by the slogans and cliches that people may use.

With respect to the Communist Party, I would repeat something that I have said at other times. I recognise the worth of many individuals in the Communist Party. They are brave people. But with all respect to them, they sometimes appear to be completely out of date. A strange thing to say of a party which considers itself the vanguard of human progress! They have something about them which is the vanguard—I admit it—in communist theory something towards which the world will go inevitably, I think, unless it breaks up before that. But they have something else with them which makes them rigid like the old bigots of religions. Well, so far as I am concerned, I have refused to bow down to the bigotry of any religion and I refuse to bow down to the bigotry of this new religion.

But let us understand these historic currents, especially in the present phase of human history, when we stand on a verge which may lead to grave disaster or which may lead to a new world. And in this how are we to help? How are we to decide which way the world should go or to put our weight on that side? I do not know exactly; but I know generally the direction in which we should try to do that—we or any country. Of one thing I am quite positive in my mind—that the way of war is not the way which we or any country should pursue. Now when I say that I mean something a little more than actual warfare—of course, I mean actual warfare between countries—what is called nowadays 'cold' war, which I think, not only leads to a shooting war, but essentially from another point of view it is almost as bad, because it coarsens people, it degrades people, as it is coarsening and degrading humanity because we tend gradually to lead a life surrounded by hatred, anger and violence.

Now I cannot offer any logical proof of this, but of this I am absolutely convinced that any way which depends on hatred and violence or anger is bound to lead to wrong results and consequences. And indeed history shows us—recent history, if not past, and in the present one can see and one can judge mathematically, if you like,—when a shooting war or a cold war continues, you may balance and say this party is more to blame than the other. It may be so. We may have our private or public opinions, but the fact remains that the result is the same. The fact is that if you have a war, it will bring the most disastrous results for humanity and it passes my comprehension how after a terrific war you can build up any social or economic order that you may aim at, because it will take generations just, perhaps, to get rid of the ravages of war and to come back to some low stage of human existence. It passes my comprehension how some people who dislike communism and make it an enemy, how they think they are going to put an end to communism by war. What will happen after that war I do not know, except that there will be large scale, vast, destruction, a large measure of anarchy over a large part of the world, lower standards and so on and so forth.

So, I do not think that it is right for us as individuals or as a nation to follow a path which coarsens and degrades us and which leads to this international vulgarity that we see all around us. If hon. Members opposite will forgive me, the methods they adopt in the national sphere, however noble their motives might be, coarsen and degrade them. I do not say that the methods, as individuals or as a group, my colleagues on this side of the House adopt, are always good or pure or do not coarsen. They do often enough. We have to meet this challenge. But there is a difference in deliberately adopting a method as a group, or as a party which coarsens and degrades and in others slipping in through the weakness of human nature. Therefore, I am prepared to have the largest measure of cooperation, but with violence and coarseness and vulgarity, I hope there will be no co-operation.

And I would appeal to hon. Members opposite also to feel that way and to act that way. Let them hold on to their principles, whatever they are, completely, because apart from the obvious fact, if I may say so, that violence and vulgarity and coarseness affect and degrade people—once you let them enter into you, it is not easy to get rid of them—and apart from that fact, India as she is constituted is a large and varied country, and there are many forces in it which have held it together, held it intellectually together even if it was physically separated, held it culturally together when it was divided into many bits. There are many disruptive tendencies and forces in India also. In the past it perhaps did not matter so much, but in the present it is a matter of the utmost consequence that the disruptive forces in India do not gain strength. Even though each particular force may have some justification, nevertheless if it is a disruptive force in the larger context of things, it tends to break up India at a critical moment when India must hold together. There again, if violence is indulged in even for a supposed good cause, I have not the shadow of a doubt that it means disruption. It means civil war, and if you have civil war, it is worse than international war in so far as vulgarity, coarseness and the spirit of violence are concerned. It is because of this that it becomes a part of the normal business as others may say of promoting law and order, which words as I said I do not fancy very much, but from this larger point of view it is the bounden duty of any Government, any group, any individual who thinks rightly along these lines to prevent violence, to prevent the degradation of our public life, the splitting up of our public life, the civil conflicts that it may bring about. Quite apart, of course, from this fact, all idea of economic progress itself is undermined.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

You cannot have both. At the most you can say: we will have civil conflict first; after we have won that, we will have economic progress, after we have paid a terrific price for it.

Other countries are mentioned, and I admire the achievements of other great countries like Russia, China etc. I do not admire everything that has happened there. First of all, it is well to remember the terrific price that was paid in the Russian Revolution. How far we are prepared—by we I mean the people of India—to pay that price I do not know. Certainly, I rather doubt—I say so with all respect for the leaders of the Russian people—if they had another chance to pay that price, they would try other ways of achieving their ideals. I rather doubt that they would. However, that is a matter of opinion. But it was a terrific price they paid. Let us not forget that. Also let us not forget that it is 35 years or so since their revolution. It is not fair to compare results of this long period of intense working—they were working on a clean slate and with full power to do whatever they wanted to, still it has taken a considerable time.

An hon. Member spoke about education. Education is highly important, of course, and I deeply regret that we are not doing in the field of education what we should do. Yet, may I mention a simple fact? The Russian people and the Russian leaders after the Revolution attached the greatest importance to education, rightly of course—the greatest importance to compulsory education of every single individual there. And yet, if I remember rightly, it took them 13 years to introduce it to every place of that great country with all their desire, with all their intense wish to do so. It takes time—and they were working at high pressure all the time. I know that in the early days of the Russian revolution there were years of civil war and difficulty and all that and outside forces were attacking, but then that is just the difficulty. If you take to the sword and if I take to the sword, others take to the sword also. In India, if we take to the sword, others take to the sword. It may be that nobody knows whose sword will be the longest in the end. But anyhow, whatever the result may be, you lose enormously. Apart from time, you pay in human misery, in human resources, and you delay that time that would make for progress. Take China, a country for which I have the greatest admiration. Now, there have been big changes there. My hon. friend opposite, Mr. Hiren Mukerjee, asked us to copy China. I do not mind copying China in so far as I can copy it; I will be glad to do so. May I remind him that a little while ago, maybe, a year ago, China was held up as a place where corruption and black marketing and everything bad had been completely and absolutely put an end to? A wonderful example it was. Six months ago, the Government of China said that they were shocked and amazed at the amount of corruption in China, and they started a great movement, in which the biggest people were involved; they took effective steps. My point is that the picture that we saw a year ago was not quite the same, as the Government themselves said. It may be that they are a more effective Government and they take more effective steps. Possibly. I agree. Let us be more effective. But the distant pictures that we see may not exactly be as they appear today.

So, I come back to this period of history through which we have been passing, where we have had constantly to face difficulties, turmoil, and trouble. There were the post-war difficulties, of course. There were the difficulties of the partition. There were the difficulties of the constant tension with Pakistan. There was the Kashmir issue, and the Hyderabad issue, and many other issues apart from our internal natural disasters that we have had in the shape of earthquakes, floods, droughts and the like. There were so many of them. We should, of course, expect some natural disaster every year and provide for it. But I must say we have been peculiarly unfortunate in the succession of these. Now, with this background, how did many of our groups or parties represented here in the Opposition—how have they functioned during these past few years? We are asked to extend our co-operation. I extend my hand of co-operation. How far have they co-operated during these four or five years, not in high policy where they might disagree, but in the day to day happenings? Take food procurement—an essential thing. We talk of food subsidies and this and that, and we go in for food procurement, and many people, respected people, go about preventing that from happening. Many of them even advocate a scorched earth policy. Just imagine that! It is an amazing thing. Scorched earth policy, so that the Government cannot have food! The House will see that the whole outlook, far from co-operation, was to injure the Government. And injure the Government—how?

By injuring the people of India, and thereby injuring the Government. Now it is open to any Opposition to go against the Government. But it is a dangerous thing, and I say a bad thing if, in order to shake or weaken a Government you go and hit the very people of India whom you seek to serve.

And so, we have had to contend during these last four or five years with a continuous barrage of propaganda against us, of vituperation, of condemnation and the like. I honestly put it to hon. Members opposite: Is that propaganda justified in truth? I am perfectly prepared to stand comparison with any country about our achievements, about what has been done in the last four or five years in this country. I remember, some years back—was it 20, or 24, years ago—when in the first five year plan of the Soviet Plan they started that very great scheme of the Dmeperstroi Dam, the whole of the Soviet Union rang with this great work, because they knew at that time that it was going to be the foundation of many other schemes. And quite rightly. But we do something here, something bigger, and we are condemned and criticised. We have got at least three of our major schemes today which are much bigger than that, to serve a much bigger area. I am not comparing invidiously; I am merely stating a fact. But what we get is criticism of it, although that very thing, I am quite sure, if it had happened in China or Russia, would have evoked praise from hon. Members opposite.

If that thing had happened,—I am not quite sure that it has happened in China or Russia—hon. Members opposite will have praised it, "See how China is progressing, how Russia is progressing"? Now, does that not indicate, if I may say so with all respect, a perverted outlook and a jaundiced view of things and a closed mind. True, I agree entirely that we should not think much with our limited resources of grandiose schemes. We must think of small schemes which will bring quick results. I agree; certainly let us do it. But at the same time we have to think of some grandiose schemes too; because remember, if we think in terms of industrialisation, industrialisation means and is measured by the amount of electric power that you produce. Hon. Members opposite will certainly remember what Lenin was supposed to have said about Communism being Soviet Russia plus electricity or electric power. It is an essential thing for us to have this electric power if our industry is to grow. For that electric power we have to have these hydro-electric works quite apart from agricultural or other purposes which are so important. My point is that what has been done in India is not a small thing. If I may venture to say that, people who have come from abroad—and among them are not small people—not only from America, England, Germany and Turkey and other countries, but people who have come even from the great land of Russia and the great land of China have expressed often enough their surprise at the measure of achievement that we have had. I do not say they liked our policy or anything, but they were surprised. They did not know that. Why did they not know it? Because, unfortunately, their means of getting knowledge of India is somewhat limited and those who supply the knowledge about India supply not facts but their own idea of what those facts are or might be and that too always full of condemnation of everything. Surely in these four or five years has everything that the Government has done been bad? It is a well-known fact that if you condemn wholesale your condemnation is not worth much. It is only if you look at the full picture and give credit where credit is due and discredit where it is due, that there is something true in it. I should like hon. Members to go and see some of these great river valley schemes. We shall welcome them. I should like them to visit, here in Delhi if they like, some of our great laboratories. Everybody who has seen them from any country has been amazed—not at the fact of the buildings—there is nothing at all in it—but at the fact that we are laying the foundations in this scientific age, we are laying the foundations of scientific progress—because without it you cannot progress. We are not going to depend greatly on the help of America, Russia or China all the time. We hope to build our own resources and our own scientific men and knowledge; I wish it could be more. I wish our Universities could be helped more—that is a different matter. However, of what we have done. I do speak without much knowledge of what is happening in other parts of the world, but nevertheless with some confidence that there is hardly any country perhaps including Russia which has made that solid progress in building scientific laboratories as we have done in this short period of time. Of course, they are infinitely more in advance of us. I

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

am talking about the initial stages. Once you go ahead, you progress. For instance, take this enormous undertaking in Sindri, our telephone factory in Bangalore, our Chittaranjan locomotive workshop—all these things are really worthwhile things; it is man's job that we have done there: it is not good to cavil at those things. Cavil at other things, if you like.

Many of our countrymen have gone abroad—I am not referring to hon. Members opposite only, there are others also whose chief function has been to run down our country abroad. It is not the usual practice of other countries to do so: they keep their quarrels at home: when they go abroad, they speak favourably about their own country, and not run it down before foreigners. There are others who have struck against certain basic facts of ours: whether it is our national flag, whether it is our national emblem, the Asoka Chakra, or whether it is our national Anthem, they are not party symbols; they are national symbols. If any group or party does not accept them, that group or party offends against the national idea (*Hear, hear*). It is one thing to admire other countries, and seek to learn from them. Let us do so by all means. It is totally a different thing to think of that country as more one's own than one's own country.

Right at the beginning of this debate, hon. Members opposite started by saying something which had been referred to later as well, which seemed to me to be perfectly remarkable; an hon. Member referred to the President's address as being a declaration of war on the people of India. He has every right to use that phrase. It is parliamentary, I suppose. If he feels that way, then there is war between him and us. (*Hear, hear*). I say so plainly, because anything more fantastic, more nonsensical, and more perverted, I cannot imagine; I challenge him to sit down with me here or elsewhere, to take the President's address and point out to me phrase by phrase, word by word, what he means by that statement. There was another hon. Member who talked about it as being callous, I believe. He has got every right to say that the President's address is full of platitudes. You may have it as your judgement. But what exactly does it mean? Who are the people referred to in 'the declaration of war'? War against what people? Are they the people of India? In spite of the 47 or 49 per cent. or whatever percentage it may be, we also happen to represent the people of India here. (*Hear, hear*). Our President also has been elected by the people of India. Are we being told that hon. Members opposite are the sole repositories of the confidence of the people of India here and they alone could speak on their behalf? It is an amazing proposition like the story of 'The three tailors of the Tooley street'. You can advance an economic theory and say that the government is wrong. I can understand that. But to talk like this is simply nonsensical and absurd......

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: On a point of order Sir, is the expression 'nonsensical' parliamentary?

Mr. Speaker: It is absolutely parliamentary.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am surprised that the hon. Member should object to the word 'nonsensical'. I can use any other word, if he prefers. The English language is rich in words. I can choose any other word. But I do wish to convey my sense without any offence, that it is wrong on their part to have used such phrases in regard to the President's address. The idea was the result, if I may say so, of loose thinking or not thinking at all, or of a completely perverted outlook. That is the difficulty we find in regard to many other matters. I say so in all earnestness. I do not mind what the past has been. I am prepared to erase the past. But look at the picture we had in the last few weeks. It does not apply only to the party which the hon. Members, some of them, represent but others too. We have seen repeatedly what are called walk-outs in various Assemblies when the Governor or the Rajpramukh came in. It is an extraordinary thing. Here is a Governor, whom you may like or dislike—it is not a personal matter—representing the headship of that particular State. He comes in, and normally one pays respect to the head of the State—one may dislike him intensely. But here is a deliberate affront offered to the heads of States like this till one almost thinks that it is a profession of some parties to walk in and out—a walkers-out party! I do not just understand it. Is this the way people seek co-operation? I do not mind much, because I hope that these days will be given up, they are relics of the past.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): Sir, on a point of order. There has been no walk-out here.

Mr. Speaker: He was referring to the situation in the country.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In India we have very grave problems to face, chiefly economic, and others also. Unless this Government or any other Government can solve them, that Government ceases to perform any useful function. Solving them does not mean solving them by magic, by some magic wand. Let me put myself differently, that so long as this Government or this party which forms the government represents a liberating force in this country it is good and it will function. Once it becomes what hon. Members think it has become, that is, it ceases to be a liberating force and becomes a restrictive and repressive force, then it will fade out. It will fade out by the process of history. But the mere fact that we have come back here after one of the biggest elections in history shows that the people of India, or a very large number of them, still think of us as a liberating force.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazaribagh West): No, no.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have no doubt they do not think of the hon. Member who said 'No', in that connection. We are thinking about others, not you. So, it will not require votes in this House. Other forces will work which will put an end to any party or group which has ceased to perform that function.

There were a number of matters to which I should like to refer very briefly. Dr. Mookerjee referred to this business of passports between East Bengal and West Bengal and Assam etc. about which we have had a conference, and in that conference thus far we have arrived at no agreement. I cannot say much about it. But the House knows that we, that is the Government of India, have not liked this proposal to introduce a passport system in the East, because that will restrict traffic between Eastern Pakistan and Bengal and Assam. And that was the very object of the agreement of the Prime Ministers two and a half years ago. We opposed it, but if Pakistan introduces some kind of passport system on the other side, we shall have to take the necessary measures on this side. That is obvious, and there is no doubt at all about the fact that the minorities in Eastern Bengal have had a very raw deal and continue to have a raw deal and all the sympathy of this House and a large number of people of this country are with them. We have tried to evolve some machinery to help them and as far as we can, we shall continue to do that. There are certain limitations. When two independent countries deal with each other, they can bring diplomatic pressure; they can bring other kinds of pressure and only the other type of pressure is a thing which we do not wish to bring because it can only bring misery.

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta North-West): It is not only the minorities of Eastern Bengal who have expressed disagreement with this passport system but a large number of Muslim representatives from West Bengal also who have expressed their apprehension that this will lead to the worsening of the conditions. I refer to a deputation led by Nawab Mussaraf Hosein and others.

Mr. Speaker: He is only referring to that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I agree with the hon. Member that it is not a question of Hindu or Muslim but all these people wanted free intercourse between the two countries and I think this passport system is a very undesirable thing.

Then there is the question of linguistic provinces a question about which we have made our position clear repeatedly. I shall be quite frank with this House that the linguistic provinces from some points of view are good, but it is immaterial whether I consider them good or bad, and if people want them, they will have them. We are not going to come in their way. Personally I think, especially in these last few years, when our first effort was to consolidate India, anything that might help the process of disruption was bad. So, even though linguistic provinces might be good here and there, the timing of it was bad when we were struggling for this consolidation and when the right time comes, have it by all means. Also the rule that we laid down was that there should be a large measure of agreement between those concerned, between the provinces concerned, because each such formation or division inevitably involves interests of groups and provinces, all round. We have been asked sometimes to impose our will upon others, do net and that I think is completely wrong. If we have this large measure of agreement, we shall do it, although we would like this to be done in a way so as not to upset all kinds of things. Financial considerations and everything else will arise and that will delay the economic progress of that part as well as, may be, other parts of the country.

Then, I refer to the question of the tribal people. I personally attach the greatest importance to this. They have suffered very greatly in Assam and elsewhere by the Partition. So many consequences of the Partition pursue us still. Many of them are almost cut off from their normal ways of gaining their livelihood since the Partition. To build roads on mountainous tracks is very expensive. We have built a number of roads; we are building them. But, it is a matter of terrific expenses. In about a fortnight's time, there is a conference being held to consider this tribal question.

The hon. Member from Manipur talked about some compensation for war damage. As a matter of fact, I do not know its early history. Normally speaking, it was the business of the British Government to give compensation for war damage. However, we undertook that liability to some extent there and we have, I believe, paid compensation to the tune of 25 or 30 lakhs. An attempt has been made to pay it fairly. I cannot obviously say that this has wholly succeeded; I cannot guarantee it from here. Some Claims Officers have been appointed, and in consultation with the local councils of the local people, it is being paid. In fact, the process is going on and claims are still being considered.

An hon. Member from Travancore said, something about monazite. Well, monazite used to be sold in large quantities almost for a song, till recent years. Then, it became a highly strategic and valuable mineral. For a variety of reasons, lately we stopped its export, although some of it is still going under licence. It is not quite as expensive as the hon. Member mentioned. He said it was £250 per ton. In America, at present, its price is half of that. We have as a matter of fact built a factory at Alwaye to separate monazite from ilmenite and other rare earths and this factory is going to be a great advantage to the State of Travancore and to India. We are keeping this under consideration all the time as what quantities we can export. It was our policy laid down a little while ago that anything that is used for the manufacture of atomic bombs should not be exported from India, because, we did not wish to get entangled in this business of other countries manufacturing atomic bombs with material taken from us. But, where this question does not arise, we can consider what quantity of monazite we can send abroad and gain foreign exchange for it.

Reference was made to Kashmir. Much has been said about it. I should like to remind the House that much of the arguments has not been about facts, but rather about certain speeches that Sheikh Abdullah delivered, which were corrected subsequently. Let us not go into that. If people know the past history of Kashmir during the last 4 or 5 years, one can understand many of the forces at play there, the background of it, and how certain communal elements have been carrying on a very wrong and harmful propaganda. There is no personal issue about Sheikh Abdullah, but something which has helped Pakistan greatly. It is in that context that one has to see some of the speeches delivered.

Dr. Mookerjee asked question about the constitutional position of Kashmir, whether Kashmiris are Indians or what they were. Of course, they are Indians constitutionally and legally. If they want a passport to go abroad, they have to take an Indian passport. The House will remember that four or five years ago, when this question of the merger of the States was first tackled, almost all the old Indian States acceded in three subjects only, that is, foreign affairs, defence and communications. Every State did that. A little later, when the raid took place in Kashmir, Kashmir also acceded on these three subjects. Later, developments took place in regard to other States and they acceded in regard to more subjects and the new picture has arisen. But, during this period, so far as Kashmir is concerned, there has been this conflict with Pakistan, the raid, the war, etc., and the reference to the United Nations. Now it is quite impossible, not at all feasible, for any other changes to take place in regard to the relation of Kashmir and India during this period of turmoil and war and reference to the United Nations. Those are the basic subjects—Kashmir has acceded and is a part of India—but in regard to other subjects obviously the people of Kashmir, that is their Constituent Assembly has every right to pass any laws it chooses. That is the constitutional position and there is no difficulty about it, that is the natural position at present. There are matters at issue which we are discussing such as financial integration and the like and they will gradually be solved. Naturally this question has always had to be viewed with its background of international conflict and that has created great difficulties.

About the rehabilitation of refugees, if I may remind the House while we are deeply conscious of a fairly large number of refugees, especially coming from East Bengal, who require rehabilitation, help etc., taking the picture as a whole, and more especially the picture of those who have come from Western Pakistan, I think I am not exaggerating when I say that the work of rehabilitation that has been done has been remarkable. There has been this question of rehabilitation and refugees in large parts of the world and the United Nations has spent large sums of money over it, and other countries have done it and all that, and experts in this work have come here from various countries and they have seen our work and they have expressed their amazement at our achievements in that regard. And we have achieved that, I should like the House to remember, without the slightest financial or other help from abroad, from the United Nations or anybody. We have borne the whole burden. I will say this that no Government could have succeeded in that way if large numbers of those displaced persons themselves had not played up and done their work. You cannot do it in a one-sided way. They showed enterprise and courage and therefore they built themselves up and ultimately this very great tragedy of the migrations has really been a sign of hope for us. It has shown how our people can face tragedy and overcome it.

I have taken a great deal of the time of the House. I apologise for it and I am grateful for the indulgence shown to me. I shall repeat again that so far as our Government is concerned we welcome help and co-operation. I had not, I regret, the time to deal with many important matters like foreign policy and the food policy and the rest. They have been dealt with elsewhere and I hope occasion will arise when we can deal with them here in a more leisurely way.

Mr. Speaker: There is now before the House the following motion:

> "That the Members of the House of the People assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 16th May, 1952."

To this there are twenty-seven amendments which have been moved. I am not going to read each amendment separately but I shall mention the No. of those amendments and in all future proceedings now we shall refer to the No. alone:

Nos. 1, 15, 25, 37, 50, 66, 67, 71, 93, 96, 101, 105, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 176, 177, 184, 190, 191, 192 and 193.

I want to know whether any amendment has been left out.

1 P.M.

An Hon. Member: Sir, amendment No. 77 has been left out.

Mr. Speaker: It was not moved at all. So now the procedure I want to follow will be this. I propose to put in all these amendments as one group of 27 amendments to be voted upon together except if any particular Member wants his amendment to be specially singled out. Otherwise taking the vote on each amendment will mean nothing but waste of time. So, is there any proposal to have any particular amendment voted upon?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): We on this side have taken counsel on the amendments. There is the largest measure of agreement on the point that only amendments Nos. 158 and 50 be taken up for being voted upon. The rest may be considered as withdrawn.

(*Amendments Nos.* 1, 15, 25, 37, 66, 67, 71, 93, 96, 101, 105, 157, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 176, 177, 184, 190, 191, 192 and 193 *by leave withdrawn*).

Mr. Speaker: Now about the remaining two amendments Nos. 50 and 158, does he want them to be voted upon separately or as a group?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Separately, Sir. Further I submit there is the largest measure of agreement among parties and groups on this side that amendment No. 158 should be put to the House first.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

That at the end of the motion the following be added:

> "but regret that the address refers to the shortage of food problem in a very superficial manner and consequently grieviously fails to note the grave food situation in many parts of the country which are in the grim grip of dire famines which are primarily caused by the system of British-brand administration still operating in this country; the address has also failed to notice that the method of procurement and the ruinously unremunerative prices given to the producers of food grains—particularly in the Bombay State—have substantially contributed to the shortage of food-grains and to the failure of the Grow More Food Campaign."

Order, order. I am putting amendment No. 158 by Shri Shantaram More. The amendment is too long. May I take it as read?

Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: I see the Noes are larger. Unless the hon. Members who said "Aye" are keen,...

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): We want a division.

Mr. Speaker: Then in order to save time, since it is already ten minutes past one, I propose to have this division in what I may describe as a summary manner by requesting the "Ayes" to stand in their places. The "Noes" will thereafter stand in their places. It is just possible there may be some neutrals. They may also stand. Going into the lobby will mean at least thirty minutes.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Recording of names will take more time.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): We want the names to be recorded.

Mr. Speaker: I will record the names of "Ayes" and "neutrals". Those Hon. Members who are in favour of the amendment will stand in their places, and I will have their names recorded. They are:

Shri P. T. Punnoose
Shri Shankar Shantaram More
Babu Ram Narayan Singh
Shri Bhajahari Mahata
Shri Meghnad Saha
Shri A. K. Gopalan
Shri Hirendra Nath Mukerjee
Shri R. Velayudhan
Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri
Shri N. Sreekantan Nair
Shri Tulsidas Kilachand
Kumari Annie Mascarene
Dr. Indubhai B. Amin
Shri P. N. Rajabhoj
Shri Narayan Rao Waghmare
Jonab Amjad Ali
Shri Ravi Narayan Reddy
Shri S. V. L. Narasimham
Shri C. R. Chowdary
Shrimati Renu Chakravarty
Shri Bhagwandutt Shastri
Shri Rishang Keishing
Shri Ramji Verma
Pandit Suresh Chandra Mishra
Shri Vijneshwar Missir
Shri Pendyal Raghava Rao
Shri M. R. Krishna
Shri Harindranath Chattopadhyaya
Dr. N. M. Jaisoorya
Dr. Lanka Sundaram
H. H. Maharaja Shri Karni Singhji Bahadur of Bikaner
Shri Kondru Subha Rao
Shri Sunkam Achalu
Shri P. Subba Rao
Shri S. K. Kandasami
Shri Y. Eswara Reddi
Shri Hari Ram Nathani
Shri Nand Lal Sharma
Shri B. H. Khardekar
Shri V. Muniswamy Avl. Thirukuralar
Shri V. Veeraswamy
Shri Hukam Singh
Shri Bahadur Singh
Shri Ajit Singh
Shri Biren Dutt
Shri Durga Charan Banerjee
Shri Girdhari Bhoi
H. H. Maharaja Rajendra Narayan Singh Deo
Shrimati Shakuntala Nayar
Shri Nettur P. Damodaran
Shri Dasaratha Deb
Shri Lakshmidhar Jena
Shri Mangalagiri Nanadas

Shri Pisupati Venkata Raghavaiah
Shri Umashanker Muljibhai Trivedi.
Shri B. Ramachandra Reddi
Dr. A. Krishnaswami
Dr. Natabar Pandey
Shri Randaman Singh
General Ajit Singhji
Shri Chandikeshwar Sharan Singh Ju Deo
Shri Bhawani Singh
Shri Raj Chandra Sen
Shri Girraj Saran Singh
Shri G. D. Thirani
Dr. Manik Chand Jatav-vir
Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani
Shri K. A. Damodara Menon
Shri K. Kelappan
Shri Nikunja Behari Chowdhury
Shri Ram Nagina Singh
Shri Tushar Chatterjea
Shri Kirai Mushar
Shri V. P. Nayar
Shri K. Ananda Nambiar
Janab B. Pocker Saheb
Shri Kamal Kumar Basu
Shri Kadiyala Gopala Rao
Shri Sanaka Buchhikotaiah
Shri Kanety Mohana Rao
Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy
Shri K. S. Raghabachari
Shri Ranjit Singh
Shri K. M. Vallatharas
Shri N. C. Chatterjee
Shri N. R. M. Swamy
Sardar Lal Singh
Shri [illegible]. B. Vittal Rao
Shri Baddam Yella Reddi
Shri Bijoy Chandra Das
Dr. Edward Paul Mathuram
Shri N. D. Govindaswami Kachiroyar
Shri Gam Malludora
Shri Chaitan Majhi
Shri Doraswamy Pillai Ramchander
Shri Sivamurthi Swami
Shri A. Jayaraman
Shri Uma Charan Patnaik
Shri N. Ramaseshaiah
Shri B. S. Murthy

Mr. Speaker: There are 100 for the Ayes. Any hon. Member who wishes to remain neutral? One hon. Member is neutral. He is: Shri G. D. Somani. The rest are the Noes.

Shri S. S. More: Those who are outside will be automatically counted out. For purposes of accuracy of the Division, you must count the Noes also.

Mr. Speaker: It is going a bit too far. It is an overwhelming majority; that is very clear. Only to satisfy the hon. Members on the opposition side, I have recorded the names of Ayes, and also of the neutral member. That record is kept. This is the first trial of strength in which they know what their strength will be. From that point of view, I have recorded the votes. The amendment is negatived.

The motion was negatived.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: What will happen to the names of those hon. Members who do not happen to be here? The same situation may arise so far as my hon. friends opposite are concerned.

Mr. Speaker: We will see when the occasion arises.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: We are satisfied with the vote on this amendment, and with your permission I desire to withdraw my amendment No. 50.

Shri Pocker Saheb (Malappuram): The hon. Member cannot assume that the same voting will hold good in respect of his amendments.

Mr. Speaker: We are not concerned with his mental process.

Amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: I will now put the main motion to the House. The question is:

That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms:

> "That the Members of the House of the People assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 16th May, 1952."

The motion was adopted.

The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Friday, the 23rd May, 1952.